

# Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 15.04.19

Dette dokumentets nettsadresse (URL) er:

<https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/cm4all/uproc.php/0/kultfilm.pdf>

## Kultfilm

(\_film) Ordet “*cult* suggests a small group of loyal fans” (Welch Everman i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 213).

“Typically, a cult film is defined through a variety of combinations that include four major elements:

1 *Anatomy*: the film itself – its features: content, style, format and generic modes.

2 *Consumption*: the ways in which it is received – the audience reactions, fan celebrations and critical receptions.

3 *Political economy*: the financial and physical conditions of presence of the film – its ownerships, intentions, promotions, channels of presentation, and the spaces and times of its exhibition.

4 *Cultural status*: the way in which a cult film fits a time or region – how it comments on its surroundings, by complying, exploiting, critiquing or offending.” (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 1)

Kunstnerisk kvalitet og innhold er ikke det sentrale for om en film blir en kultfilm, men at den er annerledes (enn filmer flest) på en fascinerende måte (Hahn og Jansen 1985 s. 9). Det som sjokkerer noen tilskuere, fascinerer andre.

Kjennetegn ved kultfilmer har også blitt sammenfattet slik:

“(1) *Innovation*: cult films contain an element of innovation, aesthetically or thematically. [...]

(2) *Badness*: conversely, cult films are also, and often at the same time, considered bad, aesthetically or morally. [...]

(3) *Transgression*: beyond the basic poles of good and bad, a lot of the competence of a cult film lies in its ability to transgress the barriers of good and bad; to obliterate them. [...]

(4) *Genre*: cult films are often made within the constraints and possibilities of genres, and as such they adhere to generic regimes of production. Yet, as a rule, they blur and push the generic conventions they are supposed to respect. They do this by mixing genres (*Alien*, 1979), exposing and/or mocking a genre's unwritten rules satirically (*Blazing Saddles*, 1974) or hyperbolically exaggerating those rules (*Barbarella*, 1968). [...]

(5) *Intertextuality*: how a film invites comparison, connections and linkages with other films and other parts of culture is crucial in determining a film as cult. [...]

(6) *Loose ends*: many cult films leave room for narrative and stylistic loose ends. In most cases, this shows itself in abrupt, insultingly conformist or problematic endings, often dissatisfying or puzzling. [...]

(7) *Nostalgia*: a core feature of many cult films is their ability to trigger a sense of nostalgia, a yearning for an idealized past. [...]

(8) *Gore*: 'yukkie stuff' is a sure way to grant films a cult status.' (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 2-3)

"The phenomenon of cult cinema is most often generated by the dual combination of a) textual peculiarities and b) specific audience reading/consumption strategies. While certain films (e.g., *Repo Man*, Alex Cox, 1984) may be seemingly tailor-made at a textual level to foster instant cult consumption (with varying degrees of success), a film's true cult success typically depends upon the reputation and devotional activity (e.g., repeated screenings, spectator rituals, obsessive trivia accumulation, etc.) that it garners amongst select audiences over time. Violence and sexuality of a deviant or perverse variety are generally the key motifs in most cult films, as are other forms of taboo breaking and transgression that somehow set these films apart as "less accessible" to all tastes (typically through opposition to bourgeois social norms). Often situated both within and against low/mainstream/mass and high/elite/art tastes, cult films are also marked by "formal bizarreness and stylistic eccentricity" denoting a predilection for considerable excess (Sconce 1995, p. 386). Excessiveness and eccentricity are also traits commonly attributed to cult movie buffs, and it is the particular devotion of the cultist" (David Church i [http://offscreen.com/view/masochizing\\_of\\_cult\\_cinema](http://offscreen.com/view/masochizing_of_cult_cinema); lesedato 30.01.17).

Ronald M. Hahn og Volker Jansen hevder at en film blir en kultfilm når en publikumsgruppe blir aktivert til å sette i gang kreative prosesser knyttet til filmen og når de lar sine liv blir inspirert av filmen (1985 s. 8-9).

“A cult film is a film with an active and lively communal following. Highly committed and rebellious in its appreciation, its audience regularly finds itself at odds with the prevailing cultural mores, displaying a preference for strange topics and allegorical themes that rub against cultural sensitivities and resist dominant politics. Cult films transgress common notions of good and bad taste, and they challenge genre conventions and coherent storytelling, often using intertextual references, gore, leaving loose ends or creating a sense of nostalgia. They frequently have troublesome production histories, coloured by accidents, failures, legends and mysteries that involve their stars and directors, and in spite of often-limited accessibility, they have a continuous market value and a long-lasting public presence.” (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 11)

En kultfilm er “a movie that earns a fanatical following by a small group of people. It’s also a movie that bears repeated viewing, and contains memorable, repeatable dialogue. Cult movies preferably consist of socially unacceptable ingredients, such as horror, sex, violence, or science fiction [...] a cult film seems to be a film with a distinct, passionate following, and may consist of subject matter that is not considered mainstream, or is even socially unacceptable” (Alexander van der Poll i <http://www.westerncape.gov.za/>; lesedato 15.08.12).

“[T]he cult film may be defined as a motion picture which is exhibited on a continuing basis, usually at midnight, and gathers a sizeable repeat audience. This working definition of cult films emphasizes the importance of the repeated regular screenings of the build-up of a regular, returning audience which characterizes the cult film phenomenon.” (Bruce A. Austin i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 394)

“Umberto Eco (1986) observes that cult films have to “provide a completely furnished world so that its fans can quote characters and episodes” (p. 198). [...] Very few (if any) true cult films take place in a wholly realistic world, either through appeals to the fantastic, the grotesque, the surreal, or the ironies of camp, style, and excess. The fetishism surrounding cult films means that the entire diegetic world becomes imbued with a certain reassuring quality, with pleasure springing perversely from a multitude of things that might not otherwise provoke pleasure in a non-cult film.” (David Church i [http://offscreen.com/view/masochizing\\_of\\_cult\\_cinema](http://offscreen.com/view/masochizing_of_cult_cinema); lesedato 30.01.17)

Den amerikanske filmregissøren Robert Wises musikalfilm *The Sound of Music* (1965) ble noen steder vist i spesielle syng-med-kinoforestillinger, og dette bidro til å gjøre den til en kultfilm (Parkinson 2012 s. 16). Filmen var basert på en teatermusikal.

“Jeffrey Sconce (1992) has described two distinct kinds of cult cinephilia, the archaeological and the diegetic: the archaeological cinephile is obsessed with ‘collection’ and ‘artefacts’ of cinema, while the diegetic cinephile is invested in a particular universe, an encompassing mise-en-scène offered by a genre (such as the

urban landscapes of film noir) or, sometimes, single cinematic text (such as *Titanic* or *The Wizard of Oz*). [...] In contrast, cult allegiance to [Peter] Jackson's gross-out films seems to cleave to the archaeological impulse. In this paradigm, fans of gore and splatter seek to 'collect' and add to their viewing repertoire (what Sconce terms a 'mental checklist') as many severed body parts and buckets of blood as possible; the films and their fetishized body spectacles are part of a larger corpus of related films – they are endowed with cult value only in relation to the larger list of cult films.” (Harmony Wu i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 335)

“Cult films often seem to represent topics deemed unusual or inappropriate.” (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 8) Kultfilmer er ofte “disruptive, immoral, scandalous and almost occult in their observations and celebrations of ‘difference’ ” (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 166). Filmkritikere og akademikere som skriver om kultfilmer “tend to indulge in offering the reader personal information, often in the form of confessions of ‘guilty pleasures’, or of embarrassing preferences.” (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 165) Mange kultfilmer er “outside mainstream circuits [...] cult films as a sort of film art’s trash-aesthetics” (Anne Jerslev i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 93).

“Much like the films themselves, a sweet sort of anarchy or surrealism, combined with irony, chance, accidents and exclusivity are part of the historiography of the cult film.” (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 164)

Kult-skrekkfilmer har en “aura” knyttet til “a ‘something’ that makes them special, like the early appearance of an actor who would later become a big star (Jack Nicholson in *The Terror*, or Nancy Reagan in *Donovan’s Brain*), or the late appearance of a star in decline (Yvonne De Carlo in *Cheerleaders*, or Bela Lugosi in *Plan 9 from Outer Space*), or the use of certain effects, props, or styles (3D, killer babies, Dracula’s dog etc.). [...] Above all, cult horror films are horrific, offering a wide range of threats to the integrity of society and the human body and and as such they act as a warning for all that can go wrong, and that is part of their appeal.” (Welch Everman i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 212)

Publikums reaksjoner har noen typiske kjennetegn:

(1) *Active celebration*: the activeness of the celebration is to be taken literally here, and comes indeed close to the organized forms of religious or spiritual worshipping of the original meaning of the term ‘cult’ [...]. A key term here is *ritual*: as with traditional cultism, cult cinema reception relies on ritualized manners of celebration, sometimes with hierarchical orders imposed on the activities, and with fairly strict delineations for roles in the ceremonies. As with most rituals in society, aspects of purity, initiation and infection [sic] play a crucial role in this celebration.

(2) *Communion and community*: cult reception is, however, not as easily described as ‘organized’ in the same sense as many cults. [...]

- (3) *Liveness*: what all cult film consumptions have in common is that they are 'lived' experiences, either physically or by proxy. [...]
- (4) *Commitment*: the consumption of cult cinema also demonstrates a continuous commitment. It is not a fad or craze. Once bitten, the bug stays. The most commonly known commitment is *fandom*. [...]
- (5) *Rebellion*: audiences of cult movies stress their rebellious attitude, and they frequently consider themselves outsiders, renegades roaming the borders of what is morally acceptable. [...]
- (6) *Alternative canonization*: the final step in cult movie consumption is the construction of an alternative canon of cinema, pitched against the 'official' canon." (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 4-6)

Kultfilmer ses på nytt og på nytt av det samme publikumet, som "love to watch them over and over again [...] repetitive and creative audience behaviour [...] repetitions constitute the act of viewing" (Anne Jerslev i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 93-94). Da *Star Wars*-filmen *Return of the Jedi* (1983; regissert av Richard Marquand) "kom på VHS var jeg den første som leide den i videobutikken, og jeg så filmen åtte ganger i løpet av det neste døgnet, før filmen ble levert tilbake. Fremdeles ser jeg episode 4, 5 og 6 en gang i året. Episode 1, 2 og 3 har jeg fjernet fra minnet fordi jeg rett og slett mener de stinker." (Even Benestad i *Filmmagasinet* nr. 8 i 2015 s. 31)

"I agree with Bruce Kawin that "the cult film has most often been defined in two ways: any picture that is seen repeatedly by a devoted audience, and as a deviant or radically different picture, embraced by a deviant audience" (1991:18). I usually put it just slightly differently in that cult texts are (1) texts in which individuals repeatedly view the same text or a specific formula (such as all slasher films), and (2) texts to which people wish to initiate others." (Staiger 2005 s. 125)

"Umberto Eco asserts that the cult film has "a completely furnished world so that its fans can quote characters and episodes as if they were aspects of the fan's private sectarian world." Additionally, "naturally all these elements (characters and episodes) must have some archetypal appeal." Moreover, cult texts also are not perfect; they have a "ricketiness" (1984:198)." (Staiger 2005 s. 125-126)

"*Casablanca* became a cult movie because it is not *one* movie. It is "movies." [...] real enjoyment is reserved for the people accustomed to cult movies, who know the whole repertoire of "magic" archetypes." (Umberto Eco i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 74) En kultfilm overlever ved å bli "a disconnected series of images, of peaks, of visual icebergs. It should display not one central idea but many. It should not reveal a coherent philosophy of composition" (Eco sitert fra Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 79).

"Movies that acquire a cult following are often challenging and confrontational in their style, imagery and themes. They will usually transgress genre boundaries, exhibiting an 'unhinged' quality, which revels in excess. Their narratives are likely

to offer scope for metaphorical or allegorical interpretation, and may resonate with deep-seated cultural myths. More often than not, they will be highly self-aware, containing coded references and intertextual allusions that allow opportunities for detective work. Frequently, too, the cult film will feature a charismatic protagonist or antagonist who becomes an unconventional object of identification for viewers, provoking ambivalent feelings in the process.” (Steve Chibnall i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 228)

“[C]ult film experience refers to the feverish worshiping of privileged film by the fans, who share exclusive knowledge of it. [...] Transgression, or the violation of boundaries, is one of the most important features of cult films. Whether it is a boundary of time, style, genre, cultural convention, or aesthetic evaluation, cult films demonstrate volatile energy for crossing the constraints of these established boundaries. According to Bruce Kawin, classic cult films such as *Casablanca* (1942) provide their worshipers with a sense of deep nostalgia for the glamour of stars who transcend temporal constraints. [...] That is, cult film serves an arena of transgression after which one safely returns home but with the feeling of transgression intact.” (Jinsoo An i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 322)

“Some of these films have become legends in their own right. *The Wizard of Oz* (1939) enchanted children and adults alike, and decades on has become a film identified with the gay sub-subculture, where gay men often refer to each other as ‘friends of Dorothy’ (a reference to Judy Garland’s character Dorothy Gale in the film). Even the drug subculture has embraced this film, and rumour has it that when the film is watched (with the aid of psychedelic drugs) alongside to the soundtrack of Pink Floyd’s seminal album, *The dark side of the moon*, the film has a whole new meaning. Who knows if this is true or not, but it is a fascinating urban legend that one just cannot help but wonder about . . . *Singin’ in the rain* (1952) is yet another musical which has taken root in cult cinema. It is over the top comedy, and lavish production values may have something to do with it – also the inclusion in the cast of Debbie Reynolds, who has a cult following of her own (very cleverly exploited in the crossdressing camp comedy *Connie and Carla* in recent years.) Of course musicals like *Cabaret* have become cult classics for obvious reasons (least of which is the fact that *The Wizard of Oz* star Judy Garland’s daughter Liza Minnelli takes the lead). The seediness and moral decay which serve as the backdrop to this truly remarkable film are the true stars of this film, directed by the legendary Bob Fosse. As mentioned earlier, any subject matter which seems to push the boundaries of what is considered acceptable, often provide us with cult classics.” (Alexander van der Poll i <http://www.westerncape.gov.za/>; lesedato 15.08.12)

“A common tool in the politically inspired cult film is that of deconstruction, of breaking down the cohesiveness of official culture by exposing its incoherencies and prejudices, and by celebrating ‘lapses, breaks and gaps’ in its discourse. The tool has helped make the feminist genre films of Stephanie Rothman such as

*Terminal Island* (1973) or *The Working Girls* (1974), and several adaptations of David Mamet's attacks against political correctness, such as *Oleanna* (1994), or *Edmond* (2005), into cult films." (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 10)

Den britiske regissøren Mike Hodges' film *Get Carter* (1971) har for fansen en plass "among the pantheon of British cinema classics" og "its status as a cult movie has long been unquestionable. Anyone in doubt should visit the sumptuous Web site ([www.btinternet.com/~ms.dear](http://www.btinternet.com/~ms.dear)) that devotee Mark Dear operates as a shrine for the film's fans. Replete with poster reproductions from all over the world, rare stills, accounts of the film's shooting and critical reception, chat room, and prize awards for the winners of its trivia quiz, the site speaks eloquently of the enthusiasm of generations of *Get Carter* adherents. [...] The growing significance of the film to a sense of local identity was acknowledged in January 2002 when Newcastle radio station Century FM dedicated a day to *Get Carter*, asking listeners to phone in with their memories of the making of the movie." (Steve Chibnall i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 227)

"The revelation of *Get Carter* is the realisation of just how vulnerable our own moral code have become. It was a revelation experienced by Hodges himself, when he first viewed his creation with its intended audience: 'I had assumed that, like me, the audience would hate Carter and would also be shocked by the film. But what surprised and frightened me in many ways was that they actually liked him.' This identification with the protagonist in a way that entails the suspension of conventional morality is a typical mechanism of cult movie appreciation." (Steve Chibnall i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 231)

Store tolkningsmuligheter bidrar ofte til å gi en film kultstatus: "In the case of *The Lord of the Rings* (2001-3) discussions of its allegorical meanings as a metaphor for global conflict, or a call to question authority, have been of huge importance in the development of its cult status. [...] And *The Wizard of Oz*'s (1939) openness to multiple allegorical interpretations has given it cultural weight and a cult reputation." (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 9)

"After the installation of the Hays Code [dvs. et selvsensur-system i USA, oppkalt etter Will H. Hays] [...] cult aesthetics (exotic, campy, outrageous, sexy, horrific, violent) were relegated to a near amateur level, where freelancers and occasional entrepreneurs like Louis Gasnier (and his *Reefer Madness*, 1934) used the veil of 'education' to still present titillating imagery." (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 166)

"By the beginning of the twenty-first century [ble det] a virtual split in cult aesthetics and its canon, with immediate (and sometimes preprogrammed) blockbuster cults like *Star Wars* (1999-2005), *The Lord of the Rings* (2001-3), *Harry Potter* (2001-), or *Pirates of the Caribbean* (2003-7) on the one hand, and slow-brewing, tiny, hidden cults like *Cube* (1997-2004), *Baise-moi* (2000), *Ginger*

*Snaps* (2000-4), *Donnie Darko* (2001), or the films Jörg Buttgereit on the other hand.” (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 169)

Den tyske filmregissøren Jörg Buttgereit sjokkerte med skrekkfilmer som *Nekromantik* (1987). “It’s safe to say that Jörg Buttgereit is a living legend. He is the only established German filmmaker in the genre of splatter movies. While it’s not the depiction of violence that horrifies the viewer, it is the determination with which Buttgereit tackles difficult topics that is so unsettling. His films are sensitive, courageous and – highly romantic. This discrepancy creates a kind of humour that is cathartic without relativising the unbelievable. [...] Moreover his first films were created in Berlin’s punk scene of the 80’s. The motto is “quick and painful”.” <http://2012.sehsuechte.de/>; lesedato 15.08.12) Kult-filmseere søker ofte det ekstreme (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 280). Amerikanerne Eduardo Sánchez og Daniel Myrick’s skrekkfilm *The Blair Witch Project* (1999) ble et kultfenomen (Baetens og Lits 2004 s. 225). En av grunnene var at den utga seg for å fortelle en sann historie.

Eksklusivitet spiller en rolle. Det at en film er vanskelig å få tak i, kan bidra til dens kultstatus: “Ironically, the lack of availability often determines a film’s cult” (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 8). Opposisjon mot mainstream og nostalgi kan også spille inn. “[I]n spite of their popularity, musicals only really became cult objects once the genre itself went into decline.” (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 170) “[T]he sense of nostalgia audiences have for their favourite films is a huge contributing factor to what becomes a cult film, and what does not.” (Alexander van der Poll i <http://www.westerncape.gov.za/>; lesedato 15.08.12) “Since the 1970s it is seen as a core feature of cult cinema – offering avid audiences a privileged sensation of appreciation (and a step up from other audiences).” (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 240)

“What may be regarded as and inscribed as a cult film at a certain period, in one country, may go completely unnoticed somewhere else or at another time.” (Anne Jerslev i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 92) Kvinner og menn kan også ha ulike kultfilmer. Den newzealandske regissøren Jane Campion’s *The Piano* (1993) har blitt en kultfilm for mange kvinner (Vidal 2012 s. 95). Den kanadiske regissøren James Cameron’s film *Titanic* (1997) tjente enorme summer, og “much of the success of which has been credited to multiple viewing by young women” (King og Krzywinska 2002 s. 99).

Den amerikanske regissøren Sofia Coppola’s film *Marie Antoinette* (2006) “was and remains a cult film among young women.” (<http://www.asecs.press.jhu.edu/>; lesedato 11.04.14) “The influence of Sofia Coppola’s *Marie Antoinette* is now a fashion cliché in the realms of Audrey Hepburn and the famous French macaroon. Manolo Blahnik designed the shoes and it’s no surprise when things are this beautiful that the latest Dior campaign and countless fashion shoots have all been inspired by this iconic cult movie.” (<http://www.alexandra-king.com/2013/07/>

marie-antoinette-costume-and-film.html; lesedato 11.04.14) I Versailles-palasset i Frankrike ble det organisert en guidetur som var kun for kvinner og som var tilrettelagt for dem som hadde sett Coppolas film (Schenk, Tröhler og Zimmermann 2010 s. 119).

Noen “graffiti- og hiphopfilmer” har fått kultstatus, bl.a. Henry Chalfant og Tony Silvers *Style Wars* (1982), Charlie Ahearns *Wild Style* (1982), Stan Lathans *Beat Street* (1984) og Jean-Jacques Beineix’ *IP5* (1992). Filmene har inspirert mange ungdommer til å spraye graffiti (Krekow, Steiner og Taupitz 1999 s. 152-153). En av skuespillerne i *Wild Style* er den kvinnelige graffiti-sprayeren “Lady Pink”, som begynte sin legendariske sprayer-karriere 16 år gammel i 1979 (Krekow, Steiner og Taupitz 1999 s. 193). Mange av de andre i filmen var også hiphop-artister (blant andre en amerikaner med kunstnernavnet Zephyr), og også filmmusikken fikk kultstatus (Krekow, Steiner og Taupitz 1999 s. 326 og 337).

Eksempler på “kultfilmregissører [er] Bruce McDonald (*Highway 61*), Jon Jost (*Frameup*), Alexandre Rockwell (*In the Soup*) og Kevin Smith (*Clerks*)” (*Morgenbladet* 27. april – 3. mai 2012 s. 30). Ernest Mathijs og Xavier Mendik oppgir disse regissørene som kultregissører: Kenneth Anger, Dario Argento, Kathryn Bigelow, Tod Browning, Luis Buñuel, Tim Burton, Donald Cammell, Larry Cohen, Roger Corman, Wes Craven, David Cronenberg, Jesús Franco, Lucio Fulci, Terry Gilliam, Werner Herzog, Peter Jackson, Alejandro Jodorowsky, Harry Kümel, David Lynch, Radley Metzger, Russ Meyer, Takashi Miike, Paul Morrissey, Vincenzo Natali, Jean Rollin, George Romero, Eli Roth, Quentin Tarantino, Paul Verhoeven, Jean Vigo, John Waters, James Whale, Ed Wood og Brian Yuzna (2008 s. 512-521).

“Cult movies cross all boundaries of taste, form, style, and genre. There are cult Westerns, like *Johnny Guitar* (1954); cult musicals, like *The Sound of Music* (1965); cult romances, like *Gone with the Wind* (1939); cult documentaries, like *Gates of Heaven* (1978); cult drug movies, like *Easy Rider* (1969); and cult teen movies, like *American Graffiti* (1973), *Animal House* (1978), and Richard Linklater's *Dazed and Confused* (1993). There are cult exploitation films, like *Reefer Madness* (1936); cult blaxploitation films, like *Shaft* (1971); and cult porn movies, like *Deep Throat* and *Behind the Green Door* (both 1972). Many cult films are music-based and have developed a lasting following on the basis of their soundtrack alone. These include *Tommy* (1975), *Rock and Roll High School* (1979), *The Blues Brothers* (1980), and *Pink Floyd: The Wall* (1982). There are other movies that have developed cult reputations simply because they convey a certain mood, evoke a certain atmosphere or time period, or are irrefutably strange. Examples include films as diverse as *Harold and Maude* (1971), *D.O.A.* (1980), *Diva* (1981), *Blade Runner* (1982), *Scarface* (1983), *Repo Man* (1984), *Pee-Wee's Big Adventure* (1985), *The Toxic Avenger* (1985), *Hard Boiled* (1992), and *The Big Lebowski* (1998). And while most of these movies seem to attract predominantly male cults, female followings have grown up around fashion-conscious “chick

flicks” like *Valley of the Dolls* (1967), the teen movie *Clueless* (1995), and the “anti-teen” movie *Heathers* (1989).” (<http://www.filmreference.com/encyclopedia/Criticism-Ideology/Cult-Films.html>; lesedato 01.11.12)

“I april i fjor raste 130 luksusbiler gjennom Europa i hastigheter på langt over 200 kilometer i timen. Nå blir det ulovlige bilracet “Gumball 3000” dataspill. Det ulovlige bilracet er inspirert av den amerikanske 80-tallsfilmen “Cannonball Run” og lokker hvert år til seg rikfolk og kjendiser fra hele verden. Målet med bilracet er å komme seg raskest mulig fra London til Berlin og tilbake igjen, og det er den eneste regelen som gjelder. Utrykningspolitiet i store deler av sentral-Europa hadde sin fulle hyre med å skrive ut bøter til de fartsglade rikingene da bilracet ble arrangert i april i fjor, men bare et fåtall av bøtene ble betalt. Av de 130 bilene som stilte til start kom 25 aldri til mål. Nå dukker snart det ulovlige bilracet opp som spill for Playstation 2. “Bryt alle fartsregler, kjør rett igjennom veisperringene og stikk av fra politiet...” Slik presenterer spillprodusenten SCI det kommende spillet på sine internettsider.” (<http://www.aftenposten.no/digital/nyheter/Ulovlig-bilrace-bli-spill-6516433.html>; lesedato 10.01.2002) Amerikaneren Hal Needhams film *Cannonball Run* (1981) har blitt “a cult favorite. [...] I first saw “The Cannonball Run” when I was 12 years old. Unlike most films I saw at that age, I loved it then, and I love it now. Maybe it's nostalgia. Maybe it's that I have no taste (my girlfriend's opinion). But I can still put this movie on and enjoy it from start to finish. It's not a great film, of course.” (anonym mann i [http://webpace.webring.com/people/wb/belialprod/cannonball\\_run.htm](http://webpace.webring.com/people/wb/belialprod/cannonball_run.htm); lesedato 10.12.13)

Claude Nuridsany and Marie Pérennous naturfilm *Microcosmos: Folket i gresset* (1996) er “a cult favourite among biology teachers” (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 275). Det er en naturfilm om insekter.

J. P. Telotte redigerte i 1991 boka *The Cult Film Experience: Beyond All Reason* (1991). “What is the appeal of cult movies? Why do fans turn up in droves at midnight movies or sit through the same three-hanky classics from Hollywood’s golden era? These are some of the questions J. P. Telotte and twelve other noted film scholars consider in this groundbreaking study of the cult film. The book identifies two basic types of cult films of older Hollywood movies, such as *Casablanca*, that have developed a cult following and “midnight movies,” most notably *The Rocky Horror Picture Show*. Telotte, Bruce Kawin, and Timothy Corrigan offer thought-provoking discussions about why these two types of movies become cult films, the sort of audience they attract, and the needs they fulfil for that audience. Subsequent essays employ a variety of cultural, feminist, ideological, and post-structural strategies for exploring these films. In a section on the classical cult film, the movie *Casablanca* receives extensive treatment. An essay by T. J. Ross considers *Beat the Devil* as a send-up of cult films, while another essay by Wade Jennings analyzes the cult star phenomenon as personified in Judy Garland. “Midnight movie madness” is explored in essays on *The Rocky Horror Picture Show*, movie satires of the 1950s, science fiction double features, and horror

thrillers.” (<http://www.akademika.no/cult-film-experience/jp-telotte/9780292711440>; lesedato 10.11.14)

Joanne Hollows’ artikkel “The masculinity of cult” (2003) “observes how camp and cult are two categories of film that often overlap based upon similar reading and consumption strategies; for example, cult films are often consumed because of their campy qualities. She notes that cult is often based on “connoisseurship” in defiance of “mass taste,” stressing the selection of object choices, while camp is more about playfully and subversively reinterpreting any text, including mass culture texts, against the (dominant) grain (p. 38-9).” (Church 2006)

Journalisten Marte Hedenstad fortalte om sin filmsmak i et intervju: “Som en fantasynerd som likte å kle seg ut i alvekostyme og sove i telt i Frognerparken for å få kinobilletter – så kommer vi ikke unna *Ringenes Herre*. Trilogien er sett mange titalls ganger, men det er Extended Edition av *The Fellowship of the Ring* jeg har sett aller mest. Peter Jackson og Co. klarte å virkeliggjøre universet jeg elsket på en så enestående måte at jeg så filmen flere ganger i uka lenge etter at den kom ut på DVD. Jeg aner ikke hvor mange ganger jeg har sett den. Den originale *Star Wars*-trilogien må selvfølgelig med her! Jeg tipper jeg har sett trilogien rundt tretti ganger. Da jeg ble introdusert for galaksen langt, langt borte en eller annen gang på slutten av nittitallet ble jeg frelst. Kraften, romskipene, lyssablene, og den episke kampen mellom det gode og det onde appellerte virkelig til en eventyrfantast som meg. Attpåtil kunne filmene skilte med en av de kuleste damene jeg hadde sett på film noen gang. Prinsesse Leia og Carrie Fisher ble et umiddelbart idol.” (*Filmmagasinet* nr. 4 i 2017 s. 10)

Alle artiklene og litteraturlista til hele leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>