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**ABSTRACT**

Using Broadchurch and its American version Gracepoint as a case study, this article explores the aesthetic relationship between these two television programmes through an analysis of their visual and aural styles. The increasing proliferation of television-to-television adaptations and remakes necessitates revisiting the terminology to assess how it accommodates methodological approaches that extend beyond cross-cultural analyses. As narrative content and style are inextricably connected, this article attends to the complexity of employing existing terms to analyse the new version of a programme that simultaneously replicates and departs from the style and tone of its predecessor.
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In March 2013 ITV began airing the crime drama *Broadchurch* (2013–17), which television critic Mike Hale describes as ‘a moody, slow-moving, complicated crime story with damaged heroes and not much redemption to go around’ (2013). Set in the fictional town of Broadchurch, England, the show’s first series follows two detectives, Ellie Miller (Olivia Colman) and Alec Hardy (David Tennant), as they investigate the murder of Danny Latimer (Oskar McNamara). The programme slowly unfolds over eight episodes as the detectives investigate
nearly all of the town’s population in their quest to identify Danny’s killer. The programme earned high ratings in its initial UK run, garnering praise from viewers in Europe and the United States. In August 2013 Fox announced that it had secured the rights to create an American version of Broadchurch for its US television network (Janosik 2013). Many critics noted that this proposed ‘American version’ seemed unnecessary, as the English-language programme depicted small-town life in recognizable, crosscultural ways, and Broadchurch was already airing on the cable channel BBC America. However, as Fox chairman Kevin Reilly described it, ‘[a]s great as Broadchurch is, 99.9 percent of the U.S. public would have never seen that show [...] [US viewers] would be more comfortable seeing something made for America’ (cited in Hibberd 2014). Reilly’s comments fall in line with the theory of cultural proximity, which argues that audiences prefer ‘local and national productions’ with recognizable humour, stars, themes and accents (Mikos and Perrotta 2011: 84). The ‘American version’ of Broadchurch, titled Gracepoint, began airing on Fox in October 2014 and promised the same smalltown setting and elaborate murder investigation. While Broadchurch has gone on to air three well-regarded series, Gracepoint failed to connect with audiences and critics, and was not renewed for a second season. As Sue Turnbull writes, ‘it may well be that the American Gracepoint failed to find an audience, not because it was so different from the original but because it tried too hard to be the same’ (2015: 714). The two programmes’ ‘same’-ness is the subject of this article.

Though Gracepoint was not a ratings hit for Fox, transnational or crosscultural adaptations and remakes continue to be globally prolific television storytelling practices. The scholarly attention to these programmes has increased alongside their visibility, mainly focusing on the rendering of ‘the local’ in remakes, crafting ‘articulations of national identity’ (Beeden and de Bruin 2010: 3), the translation of ‘geopolitical and cultural context’ (Adriaens and Biltereyst 2012: 551) and the shift from one ‘industrial practice into another’ (Becker 2013: 30). While content, industrial and cultural translation approaches to television adaptations and remakes have resulted in numerous important studies, the popularity of media streaming platforms means that viewers are now more likely to have watched the ‘original’ television programmes as well as the different national adaptations and remakes that follow. However, scholars have largely overlooked what might be termed the ‘aesthetic translation’, particularly the varying degrees of how new ‘versions’ adapt, borrow or copy the overall visual and aural style and tone of the original source material. As Moran writes, ‘the poetics of television are located in matters of form and style’ in which new versions of programmes, adaptations or remakes partake in a process of ‘omission, inclusion, substitution or permutation’ in recreating stories in new contexts (2009: 46). As important as this analysis of aesthetic translation may seem, as Jolien van Keulen notes, ‘little attention has been paid to the aesthetic aspects of television texts in relation to the transnationalisation of the medium and the rise of formats’ (2016: 1). Over the last several years a small number of scholars have begun to focus on aesthetics in transnational television adaptations and remakes, partially integrating analyses of style and tone, such as Mikos and Perrotta’s (2011) article on different national iterations of Yo soy Betty, la fea (1999–2001) and van Keulen’s (2016) article on the ‘local’ aesthetics in Dutch television adaptations. This absence extends beyond television studies as well. Vivian Sobchack explains that the scholarly writing on literature-to-film adaptations often neglects the film’s visual style, privileging ‘the subject matter’ over the ‘texture and tone’ of the visual images (2004: 111–12). Similarly, both television and film scholarship have traditionally paid little attention to the role sound plays in shaping stories – even scholarship that has endeavoured to draw attention to visual aesthetics.

Using Broadchurch and Gracepoint as a case study, this article examines the aesthetic continuities and departures between the original source material and the new version. It seeks to investigate a particularly intriguing set of programmes in which the remake replicates the visual aesthetic of the original programme but departs from the original with striking sonic and tonal differences in its musical score. In doing so, this analysis explores what might be gained from a comparative study of visual and aural style between an original programme and its new version.
In order to begin discussing the similarities and differences in visual and aural style between *Broadchurch* and *Gracepoint* I will briefly parse some of the ways that film and television scholars have defined adaptations and remakes. Next, I will perform a visual and aural analysis of both *Broadchurch* and *Gracepoint*. Finally, I will explicate the inherent complexity of discussing a remake that is visually similar to, but aurally disparate from, the original text.

**ADAPTATIONS AND REMAKES**

To begin, the terms ‘adaptation’ and ‘remake’ have slightly different meanings, which have been theorized extensively within film studies, but somewhat less so in television studies. Adaptation most often refers to the reinterpretation of narrative material from one medium to another – a novel or short story that has been adapted to create a film – such as John Steinbeck’s *The Grapes of Wrath* (1939), adapted into the 1940 film directed by John Ford, or Stephen King’s 1978 novel *The Stand*, which in 1994 became a four-part, eight-hour television miniseries that aired on ABC. George Bluestone’s book-length study of adaptations, *Novels into Film* (1957), and many others that followed it analysed the transformation from page to screen, with an emphasis on measuring the relationship or ‘fidelity’ between the two texts, based on subjective interpretation of the adaptation against the original text. As Thomas Leitch notes, adaptation studies as a field ‘is still haunted by the notion that adaptations ought to be faithful to their ostensible sourcetexts’ (2008: 64). This notion of fidelity is reflected in the categorization some film scholars have adopted to ‘measure’ the relationship between adaptations and their sources. For example, Dudley Andrew defines several modes of adaptation, such as ‘borrowing’, where ‘the artist employs, more or less extensively, the material, idea, or form of an earlier, generally successful, text,’ and ‘intersecting’, which describes adaptations in which ‘the uniqueness of the original text is preserved to such an extent that it is intentionally left unassimilated in adaptation’ (2000: 30). Along this scale, adaptations have the difficult task of crafting a ‘fidelity to the spirit, to the original’s tone, values, imagery and rhythm’ (Andrew 2000: 32). The inability to translate these ‘intangible’ aspects in literature-to-film adaptations results in accusations of failure. As Robert Stam notes, ‘when we say an adaptation has been “unfaithful” to the original, the term gives expression to the disappointment we feel when a film adaptation fails to capture the fundamental narrative, thematic, and aesthetic features of its literary source’ (2000: 54).

The notion of crafting or preserving ‘fidelity’ is central to many literature-to-film adaptation studies. This, however, is not as primary a concern for those who study television-to-television adaptations. In her book chapter about the global transmission of the television programme *Yo soy Betty, la fea*, Michele Hilmes notes an opposite trend in which new national versions of television programmes are ‘celebrated for their proliferation and variance’ (2013: 41). As well, within television studies, the use of the term ‘adaptation’ does not necessarily signal the ‘classic notion’ of the term, as ‘a cross-platform move of content from one media form to another’ (Oren 2011: 368). Rather, as Hilmes notes, the transnational television adaptation ‘falls into a grey area that has been little theorized’ (2013: 37). Most relevant to the relationship between *Broadchurch* and *Gracepoint*, Hilmes describes the ‘adapted series’ and one of its subcategories, the ‘creative adaptation’, which encompasses programmes that ‘originated in another national context’ recreated into a new ‘version’ (2013: 38). This category demonstrates great variability, such that the new version of a programme may be ‘fairly close to the original’, while another programme in this category ‘differs so substantially that it is hard to perceive’ its relationship to its original text (Hilmes 2013: 38).

The terminology defining a ‘remake’ also contains conflicting taxonomies. Film studies scholar Thomas Leitch defines remakes simply as ‘new versions of old movies’ (1990: 138). As noted above with the study of adaptations, scholars have created a continuum with which to describe different levels of replication between the original text and its remake. Michael Druxman parses out several categories, from the ‘direct remake’, which he defines as ‘a film that doesn’t try to hide the fact that it is based on an earlier production’ to the
‘nonremake’, which reuses a film’s title but presents ‘an entirely new plot’ (1975: 15). Building on Druxman’s taxonomy, Harvey Greenberg describes several classifications, such as the ‘acknowledged close remake’ in which ‘the original film is replicated with little or no change’, and the ‘acknowledged transformed remake’, which directly or indirectly acknowledges the original but makes ‘more substantive’ edits to ‘character, plot, time and setting’ (1998: 126). Thomas Leitch delineates several types of remakes – though the lines between his categories are somewhat porous – beginning with the ‘readaptation’, a film that seeks to craft ‘fidelity (however defined) to the original text’, and ‘updates’, which are ‘characterized by their overtly revisionary stance toward an original text they treat as classic even though they transform it in some obvious ways’ (1990: 142–43). Leitch also discusses the ‘homage’, a film remake ‘whose primary purpose is to pay tribute to an earlier film rather than usurp its place of honor’ (1990: 144). Robert Eberwein’s ‘preliminary taxonomy’ creates fifteen film remake categories (1998: 28). Of Eberwein’s categories, two are relevant to this discussion, ‘a remake that changes the cultural setting of a film’, or another less-frequent occurrence, ‘a remake in which the same star plays the same part’ (1998: 29–30).

According to Michele Hilmes, a television remake ‘is a version of a programme that is reconceptualised across temporal boundaries (a redo of an older show) rather than national’ (2013: 44). Other television scholars do not make the same temporal contingency distinction for a programme to qualify as a remake. For example, Claire Perkins and Constantine Verevis use the label ‘transnational television remakes’ to mark the geographical shift (rather than temporal move) of programmes (2015: 677). Isadora Garcia Avis uses a similar phrase, ‘transcultural remakes’, to discuss programmes such as the US ‘remake’ The Bridge (2013–14) from the original Swedish-Danish Bron/ Broen (2011-present) (Avis 2015: 127). Fien Adriaens and Daniel Biltereyst, and Lothar Mikos and Marta Perrotta, use ‘local adaptation’ to refer to new versions of Yo Soy Betty, la fea (Adriaens and Biltereyst 2012: 552; Mikos and Perrotta 2011: 81). There is also widespread use of ‘format’, a term that falls somewhere between adaptation and remake. The term ‘format’ usually refers to programmes created in ‘one territory’ that are then adapted and ‘customized in such a way as to seem local or indigenous in origin’ (Moran 2009: 42). ‘Format’ is used most often to describe reality programmes and game shows, such as the different ‘lookalike’ national versions of the reality show Who Wants to Be a Millionaire? (Moran 2009: 44). However, scholars such as Hilmes label the non-reality ‘narrative’ programme Yo soy Betty, la fea ‘format fiction’, which allows for ‘creative reworkings in an astonishing variety of settings, while still maintaining a celebrated attachment to the parent series’ (2013: 40).

These terms warrant this detailed discussion because although they all describe similar types of television programmes, their fluidity and interchangeability define a continuum largely based on changes in story and cultural context. Most of these terms are much less concerned with the varying degrees of visual and aural proximity between the original programme and new versions. If a remake can be defined as both a new ‘version of a programme that is reconceptualised across temporal boundaries’ (Hilmes 2013: 44) and one that describes a new ‘version’ with a geographical shift (Perkins and Verevis 2015: 677), then how do we account for matters of tone, style and aesthetics? What can we learn from a comparative study of style?

In the next section I address these questions. Using the first episodes of Broadchurch and Gracepoint as a case study, the next section explores how different stylistic connections and departures between these two programmes further complicate the discussion of new versions. The complexity of this terminology and the overlapping descriptions of adaptations and remakes become most problematic in discussions of programmes like Broadchurch and Gracepoint. At its root this study of adaptations and remakes considers the paradoxical status of Gracepoint, a programme designed to be the same as Broadchurch and yet somehow distinct at the same time.
BROADCHURCH TO GRACEPOINT, ‘SOMETIMES IT BACKFIRES’

According to the above continuum of terminology, what is Gracepoint’s relationship to Broadchurch? The early reactions by television critics to Gracepoint demonstrate this complexity. James Hibberd calls Gracepoint a ‘reboot’ of Broadchurch (2014). Cynthia Littleton labels it both a ‘rendition’ and an ‘adaptation’ (2014). Brian Lowry and Laura Prudom both use the term ‘remake’ (2014). Lowry also labels it a ‘shot-for-shot remake’ (2014). Shelli Weinstein brands Gracepoint a ‘redo of the British drama’ (2014). Jeff Jensen writes that Gracepoint is a ‘shot for shot replica’ that ‘all but xeroxed’ Broadchurch (2014). The relationship between these two television texts highlights their familial connection – particularly Gracepoint’s desire to replicate and depart simultaneously from Broadchurch’s style, tone, pacing and mise-en-scène. Gracepoint’s executive producer Carolyn Bernstein noted that ‘we tried to do a faithful adaptation that respects the original material, but becomes its own animal’ (in Littleton 2014). Bernstein said that Gracepoint’s departure from Broadchurch was in its ‘different ending and deviations from the original’ across its ten-episode season, versus Broadchurch’s original eight-episode Series 1 (in Littleton 2014). Executive producer and writer Dan Futterman wrote that Gracepoint was ‘going to start to change very, very rapidly. I think by the third and fourth episodes, you see very, very great detours’ (in Prudom 2014). While Futterman suggests that Gracepoint will diverge from Broadchurch three or four episodes into a ten-episode season, this still indicates a narrative closeness that will be evident in at least a third of the episodes. As David Tennant noted about adaptations before the premiere of Gracepoint, ‘sometimes it backfires, but I think we can bring contrasting sensibilities to the same piece of work and get something exciting and new from it’ (in Prudom 2014).

From the beginning, Gracepoint was poised to have deep connections to its ‘original’. Broadchurch creator Chris Chibnall was brought in by Gracepoint’s executive producer Carolyn Bernstein to help ‘set the tone and identify the DNA that made the original series so compelling’ (in Littleton 2014). James Strong directed the first episode of both programmes. The first episode of Gracepoint, however, utilizes a different editor (David Ray), director of photography (John Grillo) and production design artist (David Willson) than Broadchurch’s Mike Jones (editor), Matt Gray (director of photography) and Catrin Meredydd (production design). Additionally, in reference to Eberwein’s remake categories, Scottish actor David Tennant plays the same detective character on both shows but with different names, Alec Hardy on Broadchurch and Emmett Carver on Gracepoint.

While television critics disagree on how Gracepoint does and does not deviate from Broadchurch in later episodes, the same cannot be said for Gracepoint’s first episode. By the end of their pilot episodes each programme has crafted the beginning of the same slow-moving narrative – the complex investigation of the murder of Danny Latimer in Broadchurch, and Danny Solano in Gracepoint. In both programmes, a similar set of shots sets the stage for a complex delineation of character details, expressed through camera framing and movement, and lingering, pensive takes. Each of these shots feels purposeful to the introduction of this murder mystery – and each will soon be contextualized as a piece of the narrative puzzle. This visual ‘same’-ness is most apparent in each programme’s opening sequence. In Broadchurch the segment before the opening title appears spans 90 seconds, beginning with a fade in from black, showing moonlight reflected on ocean waves, marking the programme’s coastal geography. Next, a montage introduces the viewer to the tidy, picturesque spaces of the town’s main street, empty only because it is in the middle of the night. In this montage the camera lingers on both the police station and a tattered poster reading ‘Love Thy Neighbour as Thy Self’, foreshadowing the narrative trajectory of the episode. A comfortable house appears on-screen, with a quick cut to two adults, Beth Latimer (Jodie Whittaker) and her husband Mark Latimer (Andrew Buchan) sleeping in the same bed. The ticking clock on the bedside table reads 03:20 a.m. The shot cuts to a closed door with stickers spelling out ‘Danny’s Room’ where inside sits an empty bed. Seconds later, the owner of that empty bed, Danny Latimer, stands atop a cliff. His figure goes out of focus as the camera rises above him on a crane, cutting between shots of his back, with blood visibly dripping from his right hand, and close-up profile shots of his face. The longest take of this
sequence frames a high angle panoramic shot of Danny looking out over the water in front of him as the show’s title, BROADCHURCH, dissolves in and superimposes the shot. An extended lap dissolve jumps the viewer to another time and space – into an interior space the next morning, where Beth Latimer abruptly wakes up, as if coming out of a nightmare. Realizing that her bedside clock had stopped in the middle of the night, Beth scrambles out of bed.

The accusation that Gracepoint is a ‘shot-for-shot remake’ of Broadchurch is supported by a comparison of the programmes’ opening sequences (Lowry 2014). Aside from minute variations in pacing and visual framing, Gracepoint’s opening sequence closely mirrors that just described from Broadchurch. The episode begins with a fade in from black, opening on the waves as they crash against a coastal rock formation, followed by a series of slow tracking shots of the town’s main street. Instead of focusing on the police station, however, the shots linger on the Gracepoint Journal newspaper office. The same message appears, ‘Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself’, on a sign posted outside of a church. A similar shot sequence follows, with cuts from the exterior of a house, to an interior bedroom with sleeping adults, Beth Solano (Virginia Kull) and her husband Mark Solano (Michael Pena), to an empty child’s bedroom. Danny Solano (Nikolas Filipovic) appears first on-screen with a shot of his bloody left hand, and then the shot cuts to an image of his body from behind. The camera tracks closer and rises above Solano into an overhead shot that frames the top of his head and the beach far below. At 86 seconds into the first episode the show’s title, GRACEPOINT, fades into the shot and disappears as the shot dissolves from the water to the headboard of Beth Solano’s bed. Beth abruptly wakes up in her bedroom, and quickly rushes out of the room, realizing that she has overslept.

While this scene comparison illustrates how Gracepoint visually replicates Broadchurch in its first episode, the two programmes feature strikingly different musical scores. Broadchurch’s soundtrack, written by Icelandic composer Olafur Arnalds, begins about fifteen seconds into the episode, appearing after the diegetic sound of waves breaking on the shore. Arnalds’ nondiegetic musical composition begins with a sombre violin that builds into a crescendo that increases the tonal intensity of the opening sequence. The violin is soon joined by a rhythmic pulsing, almost heartbeat-like, and later layered with the sound of the ticking clock that cuts off abruptly as Danny Latimer stands poised on the edge of the cliff. The diegetic sound of the waves crashing below overcomes the musical soundtrack as BROADCHURCH appears on-screen. The sound of the crashing waves and wind grows and becomes distorted until it ends, suddenly, as Beth Latimer sits up in her bed and enters the static frame, instantly replacing the increasingly frantic tone of the orchestration with a quick gasp of breath.

The same scene from Gracepoint features a contrasting set of sounds, written in this programme by the American composer Marty Beller. In Gracepoint the sound and image appear concurrently, as the initial fade in from black features the images and sounds of waves hitting a cliff. The nondiegetic sound begins as the camera slowly tracks down the middle of the small town’s main street. Here, the music produces several different foreboding, ambient tones that fade in and out at different points, but at least one tone is always present as the town appears through a montage of the local spaces. Danny’s ticking alarm clock appears and introduces a rhythmic beat, which shifts the music composition in the next shot. A different atmospheric tone emerges, which builds into a crescendo as Danny Solano appears at the edge of the cliff. A dark guitar melody begins playing, followed by a beating drum, creating a repetitive rhythm that seems in sync with Danny’s clock’s rhythm. This music swells as the show’s title, GRACEPOINT, fades into the shot. The shot of the cliffs dissolve into the interior of the Solano home, framing Beth’s headboard. As Beth Solano wakes abruptly the nondiegetic music ends concurrent to her audible gasp.

While the visual elements of these opening sequences are largely similar, the differences in sound point to a profound shift in tone and style across the two programmes, adding a layer of complexity to their visual ‘same’-ness. Both programmes employ ‘musical blocks’, what K. J. Donnelly describes as ‘a small repertoire of musical cues’ written for a television programme and often reused to create thematic or character based ‘leitmotifs’
Broadchurch and Gracepoint also both use sound in evocative ways, yet they depart somewhat in terms of tone and timbre; the tonal quality produced by the violin in the opening sequence on Broadchurch differs from the sharp guitar notes and ambient tones that set the aural tone for Gracepoint. Although both scores effectively create a similar sombre mood from the beginning, these sound differences craft a tonal distinction between the two programmes. Their aural deviations demonstrate one way that Gracepoint, even when visually similar to Broadchurch, attempted to craft a unique ‘voice’ through its soundscape, perhaps intended to represent a ‘local’ sound unique to the United States, to differentiate between the programmes set in different countries.

Much like the opening sequences from both programmes, the subsequent scenes represented in both pilot episodes have much in common visually, introducing the same characters and situations, with minor cross-cultural differences. With a few exceptions, the pilot episode of both Broadchurch and Gracepoint continue to progress through the events leading up to the discovery of Danny Latimer/Danny Solano’s body, and the beginnings of the police investigation. However, the aural differences between Broadchurch and Gracepoint remain stark, and their different sonic styles craft an individualized tone across the two programmes, subtly directing clues and multiple interpretations of visual actions appearing on-screen.

This stark sonic contrast is evident in the scene where Beth Latimer/Beth Solano is stuck in traffic and leaves her car to figure out what is causing the traffic jam. Broadchurch’s Beth Latimer finds out from another motorist that ‘someone said the police are at the beach. They might’ve found a body’. These two sentences trigger an immediate response in Beth, both visually and aurally, beginning with a cut to a medium shot that frames her moving in slow motion as she reacts and begins to run towards the beach. Police sirens are first heard, and with a sound bridge into the subsequent shot the sirens are shown to be emanating from a fast-moving police car. The nondiegetic background music creates several other sonic layers, first a mid-range, ambient background sound that provides depth to the scene, followed by a deep, low pitch synthesized tone that rises in volume and pitch as it gradually blends into the sound of crashing waves. Here, again, the sound of the waves precedes its appearance, and in the next shot the harbour master’s boat enters the frame, also moving quickly towards the police presence on the beach. Conversely, in Gracepoint, this scene develops a slightly different tone through its use of music and sound. When Beth Solano asks what is going on, a woman in a van tells her, ‘[c]ops at the beach. Heard they found a body’. In this moment Beth appears to go into a trance, as the scene begins to move in slow motion but here, all environmental, diegetic sound cuts out. A rhythmic, repeated percussive sound replaces all other diegetic sounds. This nondiegetic, ambient, medium pitched tone mimics a fast beating heart, giving an aural point of view to what might be happening within Beth Solano’s body.

Across both Broadchurch and Gracepoint the effect is the same – a moment heavy with uncertainty, slowed down to draw out the emotional intensity – but translated aurally in different ways. In Broadchurch the external world does not disappear as Beth Latimer first hears the news about the body on the beach – the diegetic sound of police sirens and patrol boats continues alongside the physical dread that appears on her face. She remains unsteadily connected to her environment through these auditory clues, as the crescendo of the ominous sounding nondiegetic, ambient tone foreshadows her son’s fate. However, in Gracepoint, the news of the body found on the beach disconnects Beth Solano from the world momentarily, as time slows and diegetic sound disappears. The heart-beat-like percussion sonically indicates Beth Solano’s internal response to the news, but temporarily shuts out all other diegetic sound that surround Solano as she runs towards the beach. It becomes a moment in which Beth Solano is alone experiencing the potential trauma of this moment.

In another important scene, near the end of both episodes, subtle sound choices shape how each episode builds tension and foreshadows the events will follow in the next episode. In this penultimate scene, Alec Hardy/Emmett Carver convenes a press conference to discuss with the public the progress of Danny’s murder investigation. In Broadchurch, Alec Hardy tells the press conference’s small audience, ‘we are at the early
moments of what might be a complex investigation’. As he continues speaking, the nondiegetic music rises in the background, first with a musical theme that has appeared before in the episode, a cue featuring the sound of several repeated notes on a piano. This nondiegetic musical block rises in volume as a violin joins the piano melody. As this thematic block continues, the scene turns its focus from Hardy speaking to a montage of the townspeople listening and watching him speak. The texture and quality of the diegetic sound changes in response to the devices on which each person watches and listens, depicting a compressed, sparser sound as played through computers, televisions and cell phone speakers. This aural point-of-view experience individualizes the personal journey of each of these characters, of how each person in town has been affected as their private lives continue to become uncomfortably public. In *Gracepoint*, however, this scene feels different tonally. Here, the flat, ambient background sound is present from the beginning of the press conference and builds in volume and intensity as Emmett Carver’s speech continues. Like *Broadchurch*, *Gracepoint*’s penultimate scene crosscuts the press conference with a montage of people in town affected by Danny Solano’s death. As the audience sees these characters in their work and private spaces – the home living room, the hotel lobby, the newspaper office – the tonal quality of the sound does not change even though it plays through different monitors and consoles. Near the end of this scene in *Gracepoint* ambient tones add another layer to the original sounds, and the heart-beat-like musical block rhythm returns. The individual character ‘personalization’ of listening experiences is missing here, creating instead a homogeneity of experience across this broad range of characters, alluding somewhat less to the personal turmoil that might be in these characters’ futures, and perhaps also offering fewer clues as to their guilt or innocence in Danny’s murder.

Though I have noted the differences in music and sonic texture between *Broadchurch* and *Gracepoint*, there are some similarities worth noting. For one, in both programmes there is rarely a moment without nondiegetic music present. Only for a few moments are the characters afforded a space in which dialogue is unaccompanied by the nearly always present ambient, low-level musical blocks. This lack of silence connects to stylistic choices that the director and composers felt appropriate to create the desired tone for each programme. As *Broadchurch* composer Olafur Arnalds told *The Independent* writer Adam Sherwin (2015), ‘Chris [Chibnall] gave me some guidelines. He asked for intimacy and a purity in the music to fit with the emotional feel of the show. So there was a lot of piano and strings’. Arnalds noted in a different interview published on the BBC America website that he worked with Chibnall to ‘[figure] out character themes and main themes. [...] Throughout the series there are sounds that recur quite a lot. [...] Like the cliffs have their own [sound]’ (n.d.). Even from these short statements describing the effect Chibnall and Arnalds were attempting to achieve, it is clear that their musical stylistic choices sought to focus on character themes and how these themes contributed to crafting the overall ‘emotional feel’ of the programme.

In a personal correspondence interview (2018) with *Gracepoint*’s composer Marty Beller, he discusses his intention to craft individual character themes as well, and his overall goals towards creating the programme’s distinctive and evocative sounds. Beller’s overall goal for *Gracepoint* ‘was for the music to have its own distinct thematic sound – thematically and sonically different than the music for *Broadchurch*’. Beller writes,

> the music for *Broadchurch* was very successful in so many ways, dramatic, driving, beautiful, emotional. So in that sense we wanted the music for *Gracepoint* to have those qualities but also very much stand on its own with its own themes, its own sound palette and approach.

In order to create these distinctive sounds, Beller utilized the Dobro guitar ‘as one of the main melody instruments which was not a sound at all heard in *Broadchurch* and was thematically related to the setting of *Gracepoint* – Northern California/Americana influenced’, thus helping to craft a ‘local’, ‘Americana’ sound that shaped the overall tone and sonic texture of *Gracepoint*. He also employed the cello, a ‘Bullroarer’, ‘an obscure
metal instrument called the Coil’, and ‘bowing cymbals’ to create ‘an unsettling, suspenseful, dark atmosphere’. The near constant presence of the musical score in the first episode, Beller notes, was a choice made in the collaborative process with all of the creative people involved that the music very much be a strong ‘character’ in the show [...] while the goal was always to be blending with and supporting the drama and narrative that is taking place, there was an exciting dramatic energy having the score connect the many scenes and story lines throughout the episode.

While both Olafur Arnalds and Marty Beller describe their quests to create musical themes tied to certain characters and craft an overall soundscape for Broadchurch and Gracepoint, respectively, the stark differences in their musical styles make for a fascinating comparative study between these two programmes. With these aural differences in mind, as compared to each programme’s visual similarities, the relationship between Broadchurch and Gracepoint further complicates the adaptation and remake terminology discussed earlier in this article. Narratively, Gracepoint functions as an adaptation that reinterprets an existing story and shifts it from the United Kingdom to the United States, crafting its ‘American’ cultural proximity by omitting and substituting certain elements. At the same time, Gracepoint is also a remake, what Greenberg labels an ‘acknowledged close remake [...] with little or no change to the narrative’ and with its visual replication of Broadchurch (1998: 126). Yet, concurrently Gracepoint is also an ‘acknowledged transformed remake’ because it makes ‘substantive’ departure from the original version’s aural aesthetics (Greenberg 1998: 126).

In other ways, the relationship between Gracepoint and Broadchurch connect to several of Thomas Leitch’s category, the ‘homage’, in that it seems that Gracepoint’s ‘primary purpose is to pay tribute’ to an earlier text ‘rather than usurp its place of honour’ (1990: 144). This ‘tribute’ is inscribed throughout the press accounts that accompanied the US premiere of Gracepoint. Executive producer Carolyn Bernstein explains the decision to replicate Broadchurch’s third scene, the 97-second-long tracking shot that visually introduces many of the main characters. As Bernstein explains,

we kept having this internal debate about our own version. [...] We finally realized that we were contorting ourselves to come up with something more ingenious when here we had this brilliant opening that would showcase everyone in our ensemble. We couldn’t beat it. (quoted in Littleton 2014)

Elsewhere Bernstein repeated this sentiment, noting that

We did consider different starting places, different ideas for the first episode. [...] I think we kept coming back to [the first episode of Broadchurch], not shot for shot, but the way that the story was told was so well done that why would we contort ourselves to figure out a different way to tell the story, when that was the smartest, most compelling way to launch this particular story? (quoted in Prudom 2014)

What is most striking in Bernstein’s comments is the admission that the American producers did not want to change this sequence because Broadchurch had a ‘brilliant opening’. This returns to the question posed in the introduction – if the original programme was already ‘brilliant’, why create a new version?

This same ‘why?’ question is echoed in the scholarship on Gus Van Sant’s 1998 remake of Alfred Hitchcock’s Psycho (1960). Steffen Hantke notes of the remake, ‘Van Sant’s Psycho was, at best, an oddity, a novelty act, and, at worst, an utter and complete waste of time’, one in which audiences cannot help but to ‘respond to [...] not the differences between original and remake but their similarities’ (2010: 114–18). Indeed, the critical response to the visual ‘same’-ness of Gracepoint points to the entangled relationship with Broadchurch – the inextricability of the original from the new version. This acknowledgement between the original and the remake
creates a complex relationship for viewers familiar with the original – that is to say, the remake is always already intertwined with the original and can have difficulty existing outside of this context. This is evident in critic Brian Lowry’s assessment that *Broadchurch* was ‘masterful in terms of atmosphere, pacing and performances, much of which didn’t survive the flight across the pond’ (Lowry 2014). As Cynthia Littleton points out, the high critical praise for *Broadchurch* ‘has colored many reviews’ of *Gracepoint*, placing enormous pressure on both producers and the audience to find something worthwhile and novel amid the ‘same’-ness (2014). Yet at the same time, these acknowledgements of the two programmes’ ‘same’-ness fail to account for the aural differences noted over the last several pages.

Leitch importantly notes that adaptation studies ‘is still haunted by the notion that adaptations ought to be faithful to their ostensible sourcetexts’ (2008: 64). Even as scholars of adaptation strive to break free of this avenue of inquiry, popular press critics remain interested in discussing film and television adaptations and remakes within this framework. In the case of *Broadchurch* and *Gracepoint*, this ‘fidelity’ approach points to an important discrepancy of all of the scholarship, academic and otherwise, on the two version of this programme – this missing analysis of sound aesthetics alongside the discussion of visual and narrative ‘same’-ness. The sonic differences between *Broadchurch* and its *Gracepoint* provide a fascinating case study that illustrates how deeply sound and music affect images, and demonstrates the immense possibilities for how sound and image shape tone. These sonic differences are important, and they need to be acknowledged and studied in analyses of adaptations and remakes.

**CONCLUSION**

Using the first episodes of both *Broadchurch* and *Gracepoint*, this article sought to explore what might be gained from a close examination of style, tone and visual and aural aesthetics between an original programme and an adapted version. This analytical exercise demonstrated some complications, but also some benefits, to this type of comparative work. First, it located the complexities inherent in using the existing lexicon of adaptations and remakes to account for the similarities and differences in visual and aural style. However, at the same time, it demonstrated the importance of attending to sound in any examination of storytelling and form in film and television programmes. In the case of *Broadchurch* and *Gracepoint*, this close read of each programme’s soundscape demonstrated how musical compositions can powerfully deviate among otherwise ‘lookalike’ remakes and adaptations.

Furthermore, this inquiry pointed to the need to continue to parse the imprecise, overlapping labels used to describe television adaptations and remakes. This discussion of the terms adaptation and remake mirrors a related inquiry posed by scholars of genre. As Jason Mittell writes, ‘genres are cultural products, constituted by media practices and subject to ongoing change and redefinition’ (2004: 1). Like the study of genres, the definition of adaptations and remakes will always be in flux and subject to reinterpretation, and that at no moment will the meaning of these terms be stable, static or definitive. Nonetheless, this does not preclude investigation into how different scholars and critics employ these terms, nor does it discourage conversations that seek to interrogate these various labels and how they can and cannot account for case studies as complex as the relationship between *Broadchurch* and *Gracepoint*. As the proliferation of television-to-television remakes and adaptations, cross-cultural and otherwise, is likely to continue, the need remains for additional, nuanced inquiries that account for visual and sonic styles. Further encouragement of this type of aesthetic analysis will hopefully move scholars towards criticism that considers nuances of local, national or international visual and aural styles, and recognizes these nuances as foundational elements of television adaptations and remakes.
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