

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 15.01.24

Om leksikonet: https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/om_leksikonet.pdf

Kostymedrama

(_film, _sjanger) En film har handlingen foregår i en historiske periode langt tilbake i tid. Også kalt “periodedrama” (eventuelt “utstyrsfilm”) og “frock flick”. En film eller TV-serie der handlingen er satt til en bestemt historisk periode og der kostymer, interiør, bygninger osv. er relativt historisk “korrekt”. Selve handlingen er ofte fritt oppdiktet, men kan være basert på historiske personers liv, store militære slag osv. Gjennom det som dramaets hovedpersoner opplever, får seerne innsikt i politiske, sosiale, kulturelle og mentale kjennetegn ved en periode (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 14). Den franske historikeren Marc Ferro bruker uttrykket “filmic writing of history” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 23). Slike dramaer kan fungere som re-aktualisering av historiske hendelser, slik at deres betydning for vår tid blir tydelig.

Det har blitt hevdet at disse filmene er “the only way for ordinary folk to know anything about history” (James Bowman sitert fra Higson 2003 s. 183). Filmene sikter ofte mot å fortelle noe sant om en historisk perioden. “But what truth? The factual truth, the narrative truth, the emotional truth, the psychological truth, the symbolic truth?” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 28)

“A 1930s movie isn’t a “historical costume movie” unless it’s telling, for example, a 19th-century drama. *Gone With the Wind* premiered in 1939, and the action within the film takes place from the 1860s through the 1870s, covering the American Civil War and Reconstruction. That’s a historical costume film. *Top Hat* came out in 1935 and has gorgeous costumes, but it’s set in the then-contemporary period of the 1930s. Therefore, it isn’t a historical costume movie.” (<http://www.frockflicks.com/what-is-historical-costume-movie-tv-show/>; lesedato 11.07.16)

“Period Dramas are also known as Historical Dramas or Costume Dramas. Below are the typical codes and conventions of Period Dramas but also examples of key texts:

- Elaborate costumes and sets to catch the ambience of a particular time period (stereotypically female audiences are attracted as much by the costumes as by the narrative content)

- Multi stranded narrative based on character (each character has their own storyline)
- Often part of a series (each episode has a three act structure but is often open ended)
- Linear but asynchronous narrative common (use of flashback)
- Critically and commercially successful e.g. BBC Period Drama (long tradition of producing ‘quality’ period dramas)
- Often produced by an Independent Production Company and commissioned by the BBC or other networks (e.g. ITV and *Downton Abbey*)
- Often scheduled 9pm (post watershed) – representations and narrative themes
- Sexuality seen as repressed and ‘smouldering’ – on screen scenes are rarely graphic (with *The Tudors* as an exception) and representations are often left to the audiences’ imagination
- High production values (location and studio settings, costume design, sound design, star marketing)
- Distributed in the UK and the US (popular with American audiences buying into English cultural heritage)
- Audience appeals – based on historical fact (surveillance), escapist/aspirational representations of English social class (Royal Family, Aristocracy, Landed Gentry), ‘fairytale’ representations
- Stereotypically ‘feminised’ narrative – aspirational female characters but hegemonic, conventional representations of gender including dominant masculinity and women framed as objects of desire for the male gaze
- The female victim narrative is common but also a women fighting for respect and individualism within this structured framework (e.g. *The Duchess, Pride and Prejudice*)
- Traditional, mainstream representations of social class, national identity...” (<http://media.edusites.co.uk/article/period-drama-codes-conventions/>; lesedato 02.05.16)

Filmene “are rarely about politics in any conventional sense, and are much more frequently about romance and desire, narrative and spectacle, history and tourism.” (Higson 2003 s. 261) Filmene “always indulge in fabrication and invention – of

characters, incidents, events, moments, dialogue, settings – and not just to make the stories more commercial or palatable to a large audience, but because both the medium and the genre insure that such invention is intimately involved in every moment on the screen.” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 28)

“The historical film raises questions such as whose history is being represented, by whom and for whom? The theme of identity is central to the genre: class, gender and specifically national identities are among its principal concerns. The historical film is not merely offering a representation of the past; in most instances it is offering a representation of a specifically national past.” (James Chapman sitert fra Leggott 2008 s. 76)

Historiefilmer kan bekrefte etablerte historieoppfatninger, men filmene kan også revidere dem f.eks. ved å vise hendelsene fra perspektivet til marginaliserte grupper (Korte og Paletschek 2009). Vi kan få innblikk i livene til “those who were for so long silent – women, subalterns, slaves, workers, farmers, country folk, commoners, sexual minorities.” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 5) *Glory* (1989; regissert av Edward Zwick) handler om den amerikanske borgerkrigen ut fra afroamerikanske soldaters perspektiv.

Filmer kan “engage with the larger historical discourse and even add, through the powers of the medium in which they are rendered, something to our understanding of the costs of slave systems for both masters and slaves.” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 29)

“Deborah Cartmell and I. Q. Hunter use the term ‘retrovision’ to describe how some contemporary films have constructed ‘countermyths’, looking to the past sometimes with ‘horror at its violence and oppression ... and sometimes with nostalgia for lost innocence and style’ (2001: 2).” (Leggott 2008 s. 76)

“History on film is largely about emotion, an attempt to make us feel as if we are learning about the past by vicariously living through its moments. [...] the directors make the past meaningful in at least three different ways – they create works that vision, contest, and revision history (Rosenstone 1995b: 8-13). To *vision* history is to put flesh and blood on the past; to show us individuals in life like situations, to dramatize events, give us people to identify with, make us feel to some extent as if we have lived moments and issues long gone. It is to give us the experience and emotions of the past – in this it is very different from the distancing and analyzing of a written text. To *contest* history is to provide interpretations that run against traditional wisdom, to challenge generally accepted views of particular people, events, issues, or themes – personal, national, or international. To *revision* history is to show us the past in new and unexpected ways, to utilize an aesthetic that violates the traditional realistic ways of telling the past, or that does not follow a normal dramatic structure, or that mixes genres and modes – all these towards the end of making the familiar unfamiliar and causing the audience to rethink what it thinks it already knows.” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 118)

“D. W. Griffith, director of one of the first major and certainly the most controversial of history films, *Birth of a Nation*, was a virtual missionary on the topic. In 1915 he claimed that the greatest contribution of the motion picture had been ‘the treating of historical subjects’, and he liked to quote ‘educators’ who had told him (or so he said) that a film ‘can impress upon a people as much of the truth of history in an evening, as many months of study will accomplish’ (Silva 1971: 98, 59). [...] for every person who reads a book on a historical topic about which a film has been made, especially a popular film such as *Schindler’s List* (1993), many millions of people are likely to encounter that same past on the screen.” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 11-12) Russeren Sergei M. Eisensteins *Oktober* (1927) “has become and remains one of the best known and most enduring accounts of October 1917. So well known that it seems no exaggeration to suggest that more people have probably learned about the Bolshevik Revolution from the film than from any other single source.” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 51)

“[T]he best standard historical films may do something for history by showing, personalizing, and emotionalizing the past, and delivering it to a new audience.” (Rosenstone 1995 s. 11)

Historikeren Hayden White skapte termen “historiophoty”, “which he defined as the representation of history and our thought about it in visual images and filmic discourse” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 23). Andreas Huyssen hevder i *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory* (2003) at “our fascination with memory and the past is a reaction to the “spreading of amnesia” in Western society (Huyssen, 2003): the latter is less interested in the past itself than in iconifying the past.” (Marie Maillos i <https://series.unibo.it/article/view/6161/5928>; lesedato 17.11.22)

“Why do historians distrust the historical film? The overt answers: Films are inaccurate. They distort the past. They fictionalize, trivialize, and romanticize people, events, and movements. They falsify history. [...] Film shows we do not own the past. Film creates a historical world with which books cannot compete, at least for popularity. [...] Film emotionalizes, personalizes, and dramatizes history. Through actors and historical witnesses, it gives us history as triumph, anguish, joy, despair, adventure, suffering, and heroism. Both dramatized works and documentaries use the special capabilities of the medium – the closeup of the human face, the quick juxtaposition of disparate images, the power of music and sound effect – to heighten and intensify the feelings of the audience about the events depicted on the screen.” (Rosenstone 1995 s. 46 og 59) Det er “a long tradition of historical films which utilize music to make battle glamorous and heroic.” (Rosenstone 1995 s. 149)

Regissører i USA “created what we might call the ‘standard’ work of history on film, the ‘realistic’ (melo)drama that depicts the plight of heroes, heroines and

villains caught up in the sweep of huge historical events, men and women whose stories show both the impact of such events on individual lives and, through the figure we know as synecdoche, serve to exemplify larger historical themes” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 14).

Robert A. Rosenstone karakteriserer slik det han kaller “the mainstream historical film”:

- Hollywood history is delivered in a story with beginning, middle, and end – a story that has a moral message, and one that is usually embodied in a progressive view of history.

- The story is closed, completed, and ultimately, simple. Alternative versions of the past are not shown; the *Rashomon* approach is never used in such works.

[*Rashomon* er en japansk film fra 1950 der den samme hendelser blir gjenfortalt fra fire forskjellige perspektiver.]

- History is a story of individuals – usually heroic individuals who do unusual things for the good of others, if not all humankind (ultimately, the audience).

- Historical issues are personalized, emotionalized, and dramatized – for film appeals to our feelings as a way of adding to our knowledge or affecting our beliefs.” (Rosenstone 1995 s. 123)

“Getting in too close, falling in love with the endless details of an individual image or sequence, and you are likely to lose a sense of the larger historical picture or argument. Getting too far away, backing off into theoretical considerations, and the details that constitute the stuff of the past go out of focus.” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 10)

En av funksjonene ved disse filmene er “humanizing what might be no more than a series of deadly abstractions that we find in some historical accounts. (Film by its nature always deals in specific images, never generalities: that is part of its strong impact upon us.)” (Rosenstone 1995 s. 113)

Regissørene må ta mange valg på grunn av “the greediness of the camera, which demands more specificity of detail than any historian could possibly know about a particular setting or incident in the past [...] gestures, movements, and words to create historical figures whose voices and movements are in most cases wholly lost to us and therefore have to be wholly invented.” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 28-29) Det har blitt etterlyst at regissørene bør være “more honest about their sources (list them in the credits), to admit to the uncertainties of the past by finding filmic equivalents for the ‘perhapses’ and ‘may have beens’ of prose.” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 29)

“The best historical films will:

1. Show not just what happened in the past but how what happened means to us.
2. Interrogate the past for the sake of the present. Remember that historians are working for the living, not for the dead.
3. Create a historical world complex enough so that it overflows with meaning; so that its meanings are always multiple; so that its meanings cannot be contained or easily expressed in words.” (Rosenstone 1995 s. 238)

“The ‘staging’ of the past is not the only fiction involved in the history film. Less obvious sorts of inventions mark virtually every frame. These include, but are certainly not limited to, the following sorts of things, to which I have given appropriate labels: *compression* or *condensation*, the process by which several historical characters or moments are collapsed into one. *Displacements*, which move an event from one timeframe to another. *Alterations*, in which a character engages in actions or expresses sentiments that may have belonged to a different historical figure or to no one at all. *Dialogue*, which in the sound film is a crucial element that allows us to understand characters and their motivations, situations, particular events and their course, outcomes and impact. Even *characters* who are based on actual historical figures become on screen an invention, for they are created by the intonations, gestures and movements of the actor who is called upon to impersonate an historical figure whose intonations, gestures, and movements are (except for those in very contemporary historical works) wholly unknown to us. Finally, all these elements come together in *drama*, a form of telling which compresses events that happened over time (days, months, years, decades) into a narrow, intense compass of usually no more than two, and in a few extraordinary cases, up to three, four or even six hours.” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 39)

“- The mainstream feature (much like written history) tells the past as a story with a beginning, a middle, and an end. A tale that leaves you with a moral message and (usually) a feeling of uplift. A tale embedded in a larger view of history that is almost always progressive. Even if the subject matter is as bleak as the horrors of the Holocaust, the message is that things have gotten or are getting better. [...]

- Film insists on history as the story of individuals, men or women who are already renowned or who are made to seem important because they are singled out by the camera. Those who are not already famous are common people who have done heroic or admirable things, or who have suffered from exploitation and oppression. [...]

- Film offers us history as the story of a unitary, closed, and completed past. [...]

- Film personalizes, dramatizes, and emotionalizes the past. It gives us history as triumph, anguish, joy, despair, adventure, suffering, and heroism. All the special

capabilities of the medium – colour and movement, music and sound effects, the close-up of the human face, the juxtaposition of images – are utilized to create the feeling that we are not watching events, but experiencing them. [...]

- Film most obviously gives us the ‘look’ of the past, of buildings, landscapes, costumes, and artifacts. It provides a sense of how common objects appeared when they were part of people’s lives and in daily use. Period clothing confines, emphasizes, and expresses the body at rest and in motion. Tools, utensils, weapons, furniture are not items on display, but objects that people use and misuse, objects that can help to define livelihoods, professions, identities, and destinies.

- Film shows history as process. The world on the screen brings together things that, for analytic purposes, written history often splits apart. Economics, politics, race, class, and gender come together in the lives of individuals and groups. This makes history like life, itself, a process of changing relationships where political and social questions are interwoven.” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 47-48)

“Economics, politics, race, class, and gender all come together in the lives and moments of individuals, groups, and nations. This characteristic of film throws into relief a certain convention – one might call it a “fiction” – of written history: the strategy that fractures the past into distinct chapters, topics, and categories; that treats gender in one chapter, race in another, economy in a third. Daniel Walkowitz points out that written history often compartmentalizes “the study of politics, family life, or social mobility.” Film, by contrast, “provides an integrative image. History in film becomes what it most centrally is: a process of changing social relationships where political and social questions – indeed, all aspects of the past, including the language used – are interwoven.” ” (Rosenstone 1995 s. 60-61)

Filmene framstiller ofte “individuals or small groups who exemplify or stand in for larger historical events and processes. [...] One can also see innovative historicals as part of a search for a new vocabulary in which to render the past on the screen, an effort to make history (depending upon the film) more complex, interrogative, and self-conscious.” (Rosenstone 2006 s. 50)

Filmene preges gjerne av kostymer som viser sans for detaljer, og av historisk ladete innspillingssteder (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 9). De har “historisk koloritt” (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 402). Ofte er det noen tydelige tidsmarkører i begynnelsen av filmen, f.eks. et damplokomotiv eller et klesplagg som forteller seeren hvilken periode filmen skal foregå i. Inntrykket av autentisitet skapes altså ofte gjennom historisk troskap i noen detaljer, f.eks. tidsriktige klær og smykker, gjerne fra “the artificial world of upper-class respectability” (LeMahieu 1990). Seere former sitt “historiebilde” ikke minst på grunnlag av kostymedramaer (Osterkamp 2008 s. 310). Noe av det vanskeligste å formidle er en periodes “ånd” eller mentalitet (Delage og Guigueno 2004 s. 100).

“The audience uses the bonding with fictional characters as a medium for them to meet their own past; the way the characters perceive the world is the way the audience will believe the world was then. It is the cycle of cultural memory. The starting point for the creators of the series is real history, so while ‘[t]he filmmakers have built the plot from the story, ... the viewers build the story from the plot’ (Narrative 51).” (Christa R. Aakær i <https://tidsskrift.dk/lev/article/view/107775/158504>; lesedato 31.03.22)

Sjangerens historiske unøyaktigheter/friheter og anakronismer gjør at historikere vanligvis har liten tiltro til det som vises i kostymedramaer. Handlingen er som oftest langt unna historisk “autentisitet” – det er ikke helt tidsriktige kostymer, språket er urealistisk osv. Fortidens hendelser vises slik at det blir en underholdende historie. Hendelser fiksjonaliseres og romantiseres.

De fleste filmene følger velkjente, trivielle sjangermønstre med virkelighetsillusjon og identifikasjons-suggesjon. Det tilbys lite som er kontroversielt eller åpner for forskjellige tolkninger av hendelsene (Kühberger, Lübke og Terberger 2007 s. 210).

Valkyrie (2008; regissert av Bryan Singer) handler om Claus von Stauffenberg og hans sammensvornes attentat mot Hitler i 1944, et drapsforsøk som mislyktes og førte til at attentat-mennene ble henrettet. Denne filmen har blitt oppfattet som et forsøk på å vise kinopublikum over hele verden et “annet Tyskland” enn det stereotype bildet at Nazi-Tyskland (Korte og Paletschek 2009). En annen film om motstand mot Hitler-regimet er *Den hvite rose* (1982; regissert av Michael Verhoeven).

Verdensbegivenheter som kriger og revolusjoner foregår i kostymedramaer ofte i handlingens randsone, og det er ikke verdenshistoriske berømtheter som vanligvis er de viktigste personene i dramaet (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 10). Mange filmer handler om overgangsfaser mellom historiske epoker, dvs. faser med brudd og nyorientering (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 14). Handlingen i filmene er ofte knyttet til “maktintriger, statsaffærer og skandaler; skuffet kjærlighet, misunnelse og forræderi” (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 13). Regissøren kan vektlegge “det historisk-eksotiske” (Bessières 2011 s. 88) f.eks. gjennom vakre bildekomposisjoner og tablåer.

Filmer basert på reelle historiske hendelser lager ofte en nesten helt fiktiv versjon av hendelsene som innebærer en emosjonalisering. Vi får oppleve hvordan personer reagerer følelsesmessig på historiske hendelser. Det gis inntrykk av at det nesten bare er psykologiske og emosjonelle grunner til de store verdenshistoriske begivenhetene. Filmdramaene skaper et inntrykk av at det er store (og motstridende) følelser som skaper historie, for eksempel følelser som lojalitet, forakt og kjærlighet (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 18). “Sentimentalizing the past” (Higson 2003 s. 147). De fleste filmer framhever dessuten individer på bekostning

av gruppe (fagforeninger, sosiale klasser osv.), og konflikter løses på et subjektivt plan (f.eks. at to blir lykkelig gift til slutt, altså personlig lykke, eventuelt ulykke), ikke på et sosialt-samfunnsmessig nivå. Historien individualiseres og personliggjøres. Individet settes i sentrum (Kühberger, Lübke og Terberger 2007 s. 206). Begivenheter foregår på en forståelig skala når det er noen få, konkrete individer seerne skal forholde seg til, ikke sosiale klasser og andre mer abstrakte begreper.

Filmer viser lidenskap og personlige hendelser på en måte som faghistorikere sjelden har grunnlag for å skrive om, fordi kilder mangler (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 17). Faghistorikerne har en kritisk og analytisk tilnærming, mens filmene derimot vil tale mer til hjertet enn til hodet. Når det er berømte historiske personer som er de sentrale i en film, får vi ofte se disse personene bak fasaden, som privatpersoner, i tillegg til deres offentlige roller (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 372). Et eksempel er den pakistansk-indiske regissøren Shekhar Kapurs *Elizabeth* (1998), om Storbritannias renessanse-dronning. Konservativt anmeldere i England beklaget sex-scenene mellom Elizabeth og Robert Dudley, fordi det ødela for nasjonens oppfatning av dronningen som jomfru (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 374). *Elizabeth* (regissert av Kapur) ble koblet til “contemporary relevancies [...] Renée Pigeon, for example, suggests that the queen has the ‘vulnerability of a Diana and the ruthlessness of a Thatcher’ ” (Leggott 2008 s. 78). *Elizabeth* fikk en rekke filmpriser. “Several commentators indeed moaned wistfully, ‘If only history had been like this at school – riveting, thrilling and sexy’ ” (Higson 2003 s. 220).

I mange monarki-filmer er det “exploration of the disjunction between public and private personae (Leggott 2008 s. 78). Seerne skal kunne se både fasaden og bak fasaden, og kanskje oppdage at de kongelige på mange måter er helt vanlige mennesker med personlige svakheter og problemer.

“British historical cinema (like historical fiction and television drama) has become fixated with periods of national ‘greatness’ such as the Elizabethan, Jacobean and Victorian eras, reflecting ‘both a British desire to revisit history in the wake of new definitions of Britishness and a need to rethink the meaning of Englishness in a devolved nation now that England’s myths have been degraded by revisionism’ (Cartmell & Hunter 2001: 3).” (Leggott 2008 s. 77)

“Although the period film is usually taken to refer to stories set in or before the early twentieth century, contemporary British cinema has often looked back to recent history, and with a degree of ambivalence. Whereas the historical film has been inclined to return to eras of supposed national coherence or achievement, there have been numerous family dramas set during times of social and cultural instability in the later twentieth century.” (Leggott 2008 s. 80)

“Som tv-publikum føles det ikke paradoksalt å glede seg over å se mennesker på sitt mest pyntede og kultiverte, og samtidig beklage systemet som produserte en så privilegert overklasse og holdt andre nede. Snarere blir overklasselivet på tv-

skjermen en flukt vekk fra en moderne virkelighet som kan virke triviell i sammenlikning. [...] Mange av de mest populære dramaene foregår i en tid da den romantiske kjærligheten virkelig var på vei inn, mens samfunnsstrukturene overhodet ikke la til rette for den slags luksus. Slikt blir det konflikter av, og konflikter er dramaenes drivkraft. Kampen mellom ytre hindringer og indre trang er godt dramastoff.” (medieforskeren Hege Gundersen i *Dagbladet Magasinet* 29. september 2012 s. 61 og 65 om *Downton Abbey*)

Publikums fascinasjon styrkes gjennom vellykkete kombinasjoner av scenografi og dramaturgi som gjør de historiske åstedene anskuelige for mennesker i dag (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 13-14). Noen periodedramaer er skapt med et enormt oppbud av statister i uniformer og andre historiske drakter. Det gjelder f.eks. russeren Sergei Bondarchuks *Waterloo* (1970). I dag brukes det vanligvis programvare for å skape inntrykk av enorme folkemengder.

Filmer kan ha direkte, dagsaktuelle politiske funksjoner. Briten Herbert Wilcox’ film *Victoria the Great* (1938) “functioned as a reassuring validation of the monarchy after the Abdication Crisis of 1936.” (Vidal 2012 s. 37) I 1936 abdiserte Edward 7. fra den britiske tronen for å kunne gifte seg med den amerikanske enken Wallis Simpson. Aktuelle temaer og problematikker ikke sjelden “breaks through the texture of the historical saga to show us its relevance for contemporary realities.” (Laszlo Strausz i [http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc53.2011/strausz Taxidermia/index.html](http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc53.2011/strausz%20Taxidermia/index.html); lesedato 05.12.14) På 1950-tallet ble det i USA produsert en rekke kostymedramaer fra antikken (“sandalfilmer”), i en periode da troen på Imperiet og det Gode fortsatt var sterk i USA, før Vietnamkrigen forstyrret kategoriene godhet og ondskap (Bessières 2011 s. 328).

Kostymedramaer plassert i antikken og den tidligste kristne perioden viser ofte en verden full av vold og sex, samtidig som denne verdenen fordømmes moralsk ut fra et kristent verdisyn. En ung, kristen kvinne i handlingen framstår ofte som både dydig og vakker, hjertevarm og omsorgsfull, samtidig som det seksuelt tiltrekkende ved henne markeres ved klesdrakten og skjønnheten hennes (Bessières 2011 s. 92).

De sovjetrussiske regissørene Sergei M. Eisenstein og Dmitri Vasilyev fikk store ressurser til disposisjon under innspillingen av filmen *Alexandr Nevskij* (1938), blant annet ble det produsert 1200 våpen av gammel type, 2000 rustninger og sydd et stort antall pelser og drakter. En kopi av katedralen i Novgorod ble bygd i et studio av filmarkitekten Iossif Spinel. Et vinterlandskap med snø ble innspilt noen varme junidager, og et enormt område ble til dette dekket med kritt. Idrettmenn ble brukt til å spille inn voldsomme kampscener. Filmen ble en enorm suksess, og bare i 1938 så over 30 millioner russere filmen (mer enn alle andre Eisenstein-filmer til sammen) (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 73).

Alexandr Nevskij har en tydelig brodd mot de tyske nazistene. En av inspirasjonene til filmen var Hitlers *Min kamp* (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 71). Stalin bidro til å

revidere manus i den retning han ønsket. Tyskerne i filmen bærer jernmasker og framstår mer som maskiner enn mennesker. De er dødsmaskiner eller ledd i en kollektiv krigsmaskin, med et slags døds kors som symbol, mens russerne derimot har en sol på sin fane. Melodien spilt når vi ser tyskerne, virker stiv og mekanisk. Jernmaskene i denne filmen skal ha inspirert den amerikanske regissøren George Lucas i hvordan skurken Darth Vader sin maske ser ut i *Star Wars* (1977) (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 73). Da Sovjet og Tyskland inngikk en ikke-angrepsavtale i 1939, ble ikke filmen lenger vist i Sovjet, men etter utbruddet av 2. verdenskrig gikk den igjen på russiske kinoer (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 74).

Den sovjetrussiske regissøren Sergei M. Eisensteins film *Ivan den grusomme* (1944 og 1958) ble til etter at regissøren hadde fått en bestilling direkte fra Josef Stalin. Det har blitt hevdet at Stalin ville at filmen skulle vise at statlig terror kan rettfærdiggjøres når det gjelder å bevare en stat (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 86). Eisenstein fikk tilgang til alt historisk materiale han ønsket, til rom i Kreml og Kreml-katedralen. Men hvordan tsar Ivan skulle framstilles, var fastlagt på forhånd. Første del var ferdig i 1944, og regissøren fikk Stalin-prisen for den, mens andre del som var ferdiglagd i 1958, ble forbudt (og vist for første gang tolv år senere). En planlagt tredje del ble aldri innspilt. I en personlig samtale mellom Eisenstein og Stalin kritiserte diktatoren filmen for at Ivan ikke utslettet alle de fem bojarslektene fullstendig, og tsaren ble kritisert av Stalin fordi han gjorde bot etter drapene. "Tsaren virker ubesluttsom hos deg, han ligner Hamlet" sa Stalin (sitert fra Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 89). Stalin innvendt også mot filmen at Ivan framstår som en nervøs person og at hans hær ligner på Ku-Klux-Klan. Flere år senere ble filmen derimot anklaget for å ha rettfærdiggjort den stalinistiske politikken (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 90).

Den engelske regissøren David Leans film *Oliver Twist* (1948) var inspirert av bymiljø-tegningene til den franske kunstneren Gustave Doré og tyskeren Georg Scharf (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 95). På grunnlag av blant (annet deres) bilder ble det med arbeidere fra Barrandov-filmstudiet i Praha bygd opp et 40.000 kvadratmeter stort område til filminnspillingen.

På begynnelsen av 1960-tallet var det krise i Hollywood på grunn av konkurransen fra det nye TV-mediet. Et av forsøkene på å overby fjernsynet var å produsere kostbare kostymedramaer med handling fra antikken og fra Bibelen, med nyutviklede filmatiske teknikker og med monumental handling (Bessières 2011 s. 103).

The 300 Spartans (1962; regissert av Rudolph Maté) har handling fra gresk historie, men det er tydelig at den er spilt inn under den kalde krigen. Spartanerne framstår som forløperne til det vestlig-amerikanske demokratiet, i kamp mot persernes totalitære regime, som minner om det sovjetiske Russland. Samfunnet i Sparta framstår som en modell på det liberale demokrati (Bessières 2011 s. 268).

Den sovjetrussiske filmen *Krig og fred* (1965-67; i tre deler, regissert av Sergei Bondarchuk) er en av de dyreste filmene i sovjetisk filmhistorie, og hadde blant annet 300 roller og 12000 statister (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 203). En hel divisjon av soldater deltok i innspillingen, og slagscener ble innspilt under rådgiving fra general Michail Popow (som hadde vært øverstkommanderende under Leningrad-kampene i 2. verdenskrig). Kavalleriangrepene i filmen ble ledet av en annen sovjetisk general. Soldatuniformene og våpnene brukt i filmen var nøye rekonstruksjoner, bl.a. på grunnlag av gamle tinnsoldater (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 204).

“Televised costume dramas were first produced successfully by the BBC in 1967 when they produced *The Forsyte Saga*, derived from the John Galsworthy novel of the same name. It was so successful that it won the producer, Donald Wilson, a Royal Television society award, and had an average audience of 6 million people when the series was shown from January to July 1967.” (<http://www.feelgdscholar.com/paper/>; lesedato 14.09.11)

Framstillingen er generelt mer dominert av publikums egen tidsperiode enn av den tidsperioden som handlingen foregår i (Marc Ferro gjengitt fra Esquenazi 2017 s. 156). Den egyptiske filmregissøren Youssef Chahines *Skjebnen* (1997; originaltittel *al-Massir*) handler om den arabiske 1100-tallsfilosofen Averroës. Hovedpersonen kjemper mot fanatisme og for intellektuell frihet og humanisme – og filmen fungerte som en oppfordring til toleranse i Egypt i regissørens samtid (Abdelmajid Babakhouya i <http://babel.revues.org/806>; lesedato 10.04.15).

“Alle historiske filmer og tv-serier er anakronistiske. Det vil alltid finnes spor av ståstedet til den som forteller, bevisst eller ubevisst. Bare om rollefigurene har hvite, sunne tenner, er det i uoverensstemmelse med slik det var gjennom mesteparten av historien. Tv-serier og filmer er dessuten noe annet enn skoletimer. Det publikum ser, vil være formet av en estetisk plan like mye som historiens snevre ramme, og skapt for å uttrykke noe mer og annet enn autentisitet. Iblant er det snakk om en sterk stilisering som fjerner historien fra virkelighetens støv og svette, uten at det gjør noe, fordi det er med på å skape en fjern og eventyrlig fiksjonsverden som overbeviser på sine premisser. [...] Den vanligste kløen er når filmskaperne lar en helt eller heltinne forfekte verdier fra det 21. århundre mot omgivelser som framstilles som forstokkede fordi de ennå ikke har sett lyset – lyset som er sett av filmens 2013-publikum og som tillater dem å føle seg moralsk overlegne en forgangen tid. Slik fordamper troverdigheten.” (Inger Merete Hobbelstad i *Dagbladet* 25. juni 2013 s. 2)

Den franske filmregissøren Éric Rohmers *The Lady & the Duke* (2001) har handling fra den franske revolusjonen. I alle utendørsscener er det malte tablåer som menneskene beveger seg foran. Disse tablåene viser hvordan Paris og omegn så ut på slutten av 1700-tallet. Innendørsscenene virker “autentiske” når det gjelder interiører og de kostymene skuespillerne har.

I filmen *Leoparden* (1963; regissert av italieneren Luchino Visconti) brukes en danse-/ballscene på en måte som er typisk for historiske dramaer. Scenen gir seerne et speilbilde av sosiale og politiske strukturer i samfunnet (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 201).

“Nearly every filmed adaptation of a Jane Austen novel includes a ball scene – lines of women in long dresses joining hands with lines of men in knee breeches, stepping gracefully forward and back, turning away and coming together, in a symbolic enactment of the push-pull of Austen’s courtship plots.” (Yaffe 2013 s. 204)

Den amerikanske regissøren Stanley Kubricks film *Barry Lyndon* (1975; basert på en roman av den britiske 1800-tallsforfatteren William Makepeace Thackeray) “may be the most visually beautiful film ever made. At once stylized and charged with immediacy, its evocations of the battlefields, gaming tables, festivals and spas of a vanished age have probably never been equaled as spectacles of life transformed by the camera in to visions of aesthetic splendor; perhaps no selection of musical pieces has ever been so aptly and movingly integrated into the action of any film. But this beauty is more than a matter of scenery and score. It radiates from the tension between Barry’s vitality and the brilliant scenes and objects which surround it: this beauty depends on Barry’s presence. Kubrick repeatedly “places” Barry, or some pertinent image of entity, then slowly pulls back, establishing at the center of each vast tableau a human impulse that informs the swelling scene with mystery.” (Mark Crispin Miller i <http://www.visual-memory.co.uk/amk/doc/0086.html>; lesedato 14.09.11)

Milos Formans film *Amadeus* (1984) “is arguably the best motion picture ever made about the process of creation and the creator. By electing not to progress in the direction of a traditional bio-pic, director Milos Forman and screenwriter Peter Shaffer have crafted an amazing portrait of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, filled with rich details, powerful drama, and a commanding score. Amadeus is an achievement, and was deserving of every one of the eight Oscars it captured on that late March night in 1985.” (<http://www.reelviews.net/movies/a/amadeus.html>; lesedato 14.09.11)

Den kanadisk-amerikanske regissøren James Camerons *Titanic* (1997) var basert på grundige historiske studier og vitneskildringer fra overlevende. “The history of Titanic is something that Cameron studied intensely. He’ll be one of the first to admit, however, that his film isn’t about recreating historical accuracy. In the book *James Cameron’s Titanic*, he states, “Where the facts are clear we have been absolutely rigorous in restaging events. Where they are unclear, I have made my own choices, a few of which may be controversial to students of Titanic history.” (<http://www.hollywoodlot.com/hl.php/a/34c/>; lesedato 15.09.11) I samme bok legger han til: “Though I may not always have made a traditional interpretation, I

can assure the reader and the viewer that these are conscious and well-informed decisions and not casual Hollywood mistakes.”

“What is so special about period drama? What distinguishes this genre of film from the others is that whereas the majority of films are fictional, period dramas are based, however loosely and with however much poetic licence, on historical facts. Consequently, while all films offer escapism from our worries and stress, a period drama transports us back in time and engulfs us in a lifestyle of a bygone era, so giving us a glimpse of the world as experienced by our ancestors [...] Alongside the costumes come the deftly transfigured town and country settings, which serve to complete the illusion that we are in a different age. Some may be purpose-built sets, but others must be real city scenes that have been miraculously altered and filmed with all traces of the present day eliminated. Interior décor of houses, castles, ships, old cars, trains and railway stations, depending on the period, all offer powerful imagery to enhance the illusion.” (M. Gowlett i <http://www.perioddramas.com/articles/why-are-period-dramas-so-popular.php>; lesedato 08.04.11)

“Period dramas come in all types, ranging from the peaceful, romantic sagas focusing on family life, such as the Jane Austen dramas, to the violent, action stories of Shakespeare’s kings. Some have feel-good, happy endings, typically where everyone happily marries their chosen one; others profoundly sad endings, such as “Tess of the D’Urbervilles”, where we are left in tears. Many show us the enormous gulf that existed between rich and poor (even more than today), where the rich were all powerful and the poor were bereft of any semblance of justice, or, at best, subject to unforgivably hard justice, as typified by “Les Misérables”. Such films serve to remind us how thankful we should be for medical advances and our health and legal systems, even if we do complain about them” (M. Gowlett i <http://www.perioddramas.com/articles/why-are-period-dramas-so-popular.php>; lesedato 08.04.11).

“As a female, I enjoy those peaceful dramas where the pace of life is gentle and the accent is on people’s thoughts and feelings rather than on action. We see that some women were frustrated by the restrictions placed on them by society, as we certainly would be too, but we also observe that women in Jane Austen’s day seemed to have quite a nice peaceful existence, which appears rather attractive when we are feeling too busy! In her world, even in families that considered themselves quite poor (not the really poor!), the work load of the lady of the house comprised controlling the housekeeping, not actually doing the housework herself! For her daughters, “work” was nothing more arduous than sewing: mending, altering (to comply with the latest fashion) and making nightwear/underwear during the privacy of the mornings; more delicate work, such as embroidery, in the afternoons when a visitor might call. And for the whole family, the evenings were devoted to sociable pursuits (actually, I happen to really enjoy sewing, but don’t often seem to find the time!). This type of film doesn’t appeal to my husband – not

enough action! [...] His macho hormones dictate that his preferred genre of film must contain elements of adventure, violence and intrigue. There are plenty of period dramas that provide all of these. Fighting has always been a way of settling disputes, both on and off the battlefield: having sex has, of course, always been a fundamental part of life, and in the past there were fewer other forms of entertainment; and monarchs of yesteryear had the power to dispose of unwanted rivals and seemed to have no scruples about using that power. Consequently, fierce fighting, passionate love-making and royal executions feature accordingly in the more violent types of period drama.” (M. Gowlett i <http://www.perioddramas.com/articles/why-are-period-dramas-so-popular.php>; lesedato 08.04.11)

“Whatever type of period drama is for each of us, all of them provide a great form of escapism. What they all have in common is that life was less complicated then than it is now, with all our many options but so many accompanying stresses! This for me is the key to period drama’s appeal. To escape, we can also look to the future. This may be very exciting but I can only imagine that life in the future will have even more complications and stress. Personally, for entertainment, I prefer to look back towards simplicity. It’s more relaxing!” (M. Gowlett i <http://www.perioddramas.com/articles/why-are-period-dramas-so-popular.php>; lesedato 08.04.11)

Kulturjournalisten Inger Merete Hobbestad skrev i 2011 om Storbritannia at når det gjelder “urettferdighetene knyttet til Storbritannias strenge klassesamfunn, er det fremdeles de som hører til sosial klasse A og B som er øyrikets fremste eksportvare. [...] Vi trekkes jo mot det påkostede, det smakfullt glamorøse, det unyttig vakre. Det er noe av en nytelse å se den typen uanstrengte gode manerer som for det aller meste er et produkt av en privilegert og omhyggelig oppdragelse *far from the madding crowd*, gjerne i kombinasjon med de påkrevde sukk over systemet som gjorde at det var slik. Vi får ofte se mennesker på sitt mest kultiverte. Det er ikke alltid de er blitt gode mennesker av den grunn, heldigvis ikke, men de er i alle fall velformulert underholdende. [...] Ofte er vi i en førmeritokratisk tid der mange av de handlende er født inn i en rolle de verken har ønsket eller fortjent. Så er det om å gjøre å takle denne rollen – bestemme seg for å bryte ut av den, eller, som regel, om å vokse inn i den. Det handler om å bli det du allerede er. Elizabeth II og George VI må finne nytt innhold i rollen som monark i “The Queen” og “The King’s Speech”. Mr Darcy i “Pride and Prejudice” og de adelige døtrene i “Downton Abbey” opplever alle sterke føringer på livene sine på grunn av at de er født til formue og fornemhet.” (http://ingermerete.blogg.no/1313795392_pomp_and_circumstance.html; lesedato 14.01.16)

“For et publikum som vil føle noe holder det ikke å se noen forelske seg, vi vil se hovedpersoner som blir satt på prøve og foredlet av kjærligheten. Vi vil se folk ønske så sterkt å redde noe eller beskytte noe at de trosser hindringer og overvinner seg selv. Med dannelsen og den (relative) rikdommen til hovedpersonene i fortellingen fra de øvre britiske sosiale lagene, kommer en ufrihet. Unge menn *in*

possession of a good fortune får ikke velge make uten slektens bifall. Unge kvinner må holde sin sti gnistrende ren. Alt de har, kan tapes. At de blir lykkelige, er ikke nødvendigvis noe mål for omgivelsene. I dag, der valgfriheten kan være så døvende at problemene nærmest er kontraster av disse, skaper dette en nerve. Dilemmaene blir tydeligere enn vi kanskje føler våre egne er: De er mellom en person og en familie, en person og en klasse, i stedet for inne i én enkeltperson.” (Inger Meret Hobbestad i http://ingermerete.blogg.no/1313795392_pomp_and_circumstance.html; lesedato 27.01.16)

Publikum liker “den vakre måten de lever på [...] Et meritokratisk karrieresystem og nye regler for suksess og ærbødighet blir uunngåelige. “Downton Abbey” er ekstremt bevisst på skjebnen som venter familier som jarlens. [...] Men omgangsformen og livsstilen som springer ut av nettopp en slik posisjon, elskes ennå – særlig i den svermeriske, nostalgiske, høynede og antagelig ganske urealistiske form den får i populærkulturen. Den hermetisk lukkede britiske overklassen møter opprør og kritikk – men samtidig er det altså noe i svært mange som fremdeles vil beholde, i bøker og på tv-skjermer og kinolerreter, en flik av den fornemme verden de representerer.” (Inger Meret Hobbestad i http://ingermerete.blogg.no/1313795392_pomp_and_circumstance.html; lesedato 14.01.16)

I *Downton Abbey* “the depicted reactionary circles are those in which change is slower, since they resist it. [...] contemporary ambivalence for a country glorified for its past (“There was a time when Britannia really did rule the waves, and it’s a memory which has never wholly faded”, Bell & Gray, 2007: 201) yet nowadays quite Americanized, bringing the United Kingdom in general and *Downton Abbey* in particular to a form of self-exoticism. [...] The past transitions represented are actually a reading of present junctions.” (Marie Maillos i <https://series.unibo.it/article/view/6161/5928>; lesedato 17.11.22)

“Ta *Downton Abbey*. Hvorfor er millioner av mennesker verden over – fra Europa til USA til Asia – så tiltrukket av disse karakterene fra den britiske overklassen på 1920-tallet? Ser de nostalgisk mot en svunnen tid? Eller er de fascinert av det sosiale spillet som serien utforsker? Serieskaperen Julian Fellowes mener forklaringen finnes et annet sted – i vår leting etter orden i en kaotisk verden. Folk føler seg så desorientert i våre dager, mener han, at de trekkes mot *Downton Abbeys* stramme univers, hvor alt har sin plass innenfor strenge rammer.” (Dominique Moisi i *Morgenbladet* 24.–30. april 2015 s. 26) Serien kan kalles “period soap opera” (Higson 2003 s. 180).

“How About No More ‘Posh Porn’ From the Brits for a While [...] Enough “Downton Abbey,” “Parade’s End” and stiff upper lips. Let’s take a break from British history – a history we don’t share – and stay modern for a while. [...] And so it is with my newfound desire to not watch another British series that focuses on the woes of the aristocracy right around World War I when they couldn’t express any emotions, worried about appearances and had a bunch of people downstairs

who waited on them hand and foot. [...] But why do we Americans love these costume dramas so much? [...] This Yankee fascination with England's rich past (in both ways) makes little sense beyond some kind of wish fulfillment or kinky fantasy. The fact that millions of people watched the first two seasons of *Downton Abbey* while our economy was on the brink is even more fascinating (and yes, maybe that was part of the point – money being the money shot in these dramas of the idle rich)." (Tim Goodman i <http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/bastard-machine/downton-abbey-posh-overkill-arrives-423054>; lesedato 10.06.15)

"For a long time, particularly in the 1970s, '80s and '90s, British films and television were extremely uncomfortable with an aristocratic past, showing their members as stupid or bad, upper class twits and malevolent villains," Bruce says. "But there has been an evolution in Britain. Since Tony Blair abolished hereditary peerages, so even members who had traditionally inherited a seat had to be elected by their constituencies, British society has been evolving so as not to be offended by their past." Instead, they embrace it in all its splendor, as it appears in *Downton Abbey*." (Alastair Bruce i <http://www.indyweek.com/arts/archives/2014/12/30/interview-downton-abbey-historical-advisor-alastair-bruce-visits-the-triangle>; lesedato 18.01.16)

Downton Abbey "glamorizes the British legacy by idealizing it, yet it offers a nostalgic representation of the British culture that is entirely backward-looking. [...] Because the characters from *Downton Abbey*, whose story takes place in a transition era, appear to us both more likeable and less comical than those from *Gosford Park* [2001; regissert av Robert Altman], the irony is that the viewers become inclined to resist change with them, to embrace their reactionary wishes, or at least recognize the ambivalence at work, as Tom Branson does. The show's audience, while witnessing the transition, is led to adopt an anti-progressive attitude and swim against the tide of history." (Marie Maillos i <https://series.unibo.it/article/view/6161/5928>; lesedato 17.11.22)

"Although the majority of British films of the 1990s and 2000s have contemporary settings, 'period' or 'costume' films have played a disproportionately large role in the conceptualisation of British cinema as fundamentally backwards-looking." (Leggott 2008 s. 75-76)

"[T]he European super-production *Sibirskij Tsiryulnik* (*The Barber of Siberia*, Nikita Mikhalkov, 1998) brought together international funds and personnel for a large scale film that taps into the iconography of Tsarist Russia, as seen through the eyes of American traveller Jane Callahan [...] The publicity campaign that accompanied the film's release included the launch of an associated vodka brand and a perfume range, helping to transform *The Barber of Siberia* into an extended commercial for the 'product Russia' " (Vidal 2012 s. 61).

Filmer med handling fra Romerriket har ofte vært preget av “gigantomani” (Osterkamp 2008 s. 317). Romerriket ble i amerikanske filmer gjennom flere tiår vist som en storslagen parallell til “det amerikanske imperiet”, og det var ikke før med Stanley Kubricks *Spartacus* (1960) at opprørere ble framstilt som helter (Ferro 1993 s. 234). Filmene spiller også ofte opp til forventninger, f.eks. om at romerske soldater alltid bærer sine egne våpen, noe de ikke gjorde under f.eks. triumftog i sentrum av Roma. Da bar soldatene fiendens våpen og rustningsdeler som trofeer, ikke sine vanlige våpen som de hadde brukt i krigen (Osterkamp 2008 s. 322).

Den amerikanske regissøren William Wylers film *Ben Hur* (1959) inneholder en massescene som krevde nesten 50.000 statister (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 163). “The colorful 1959 version was the *most* expensive film ever made up to its time, and the most expensive film of the 50s decade. At \$15 million and shot on a grand scale, it was a tremendous make-or-break risk for MGM Studios – and ultimately saved the studio from bankruptcy. [...] It took six years to prepare for the film shoot, and over a half year of on-location work in Italy, with thousands of extras. [...] It was one of the most honored, award-winning films of all time. [...] The chariot race sequence in the Circus Maximus (an amazing replica of the one in Rome) is one of the most thrilling and famous in film history. [...] The site of the race, the Circus Maximus in Jerusalem (Judea), was constructed on over 18 acres of backlot space at Cinecitta Studios outside Rome, and the filming of the sequence took about five weeks. Except for two of the most spectacular stunts, both Charlton Heston and Stephen Boyd did all their own chariot driving in the carefully-choreographed sequence.” (<http://www.filmsite.org/benh.html>; lesedato 07.09.15) “A hundred and fifty horses were killed during the filming of the chariot race in the 1925 version of *Ben Hur*” (Steve Baker i <https://ur.booksc.eu/book/51769049/558932>; lesedato 27.05.22). Det ble brukt over én million rekvisitter under den tre år lange innspillingen (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 164). Men en kvinnelig ekspert på romersk historie skal under innspillingen ha sagt til regissøren William Wyler at hvis han ønsket at filmen skulle være realistisk, måtte han brenne alt han hittil hadde spilt inn (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 163).

Gladiator (2000, regissert av Ridley Scott) handler om en romersk general som ender som slave og gladiator. Tyskeren Marcus Junkelmann gjennomførte en spørreundersøkelse om *Gladiator*, og flertallet av de han spurte ble irriterte da de fikk vite at filmen var full av historiske feil (Osterkamp 2008 s. 310). Seernes irritasjon skyldtes ikke minst at feilene var gjort bevisst og med hensikt, ikke av finansielle eller tekniske begrensninger. Mange sa at de ikke ville sett filmen hvis de visste at den inneholdt store historiske feil (s. 310). Professor Kathleen Coleman, ekspert på antikken ved Harvard University, var rådgiver før innspillingen av *Gladiator*. Hun var ikke bare opptatt av historisk nøyaktighet, snarere av filmen som historieformidling og -popularisering. Coleman ønsket “conscious decisions based upon esthetics, pragmatism, or an estimation of the public appetite” for en filmhandling fra Romerriket. Hun konstaterte senere at

interessen for hennes latin-filologiske kurs økte etter at filmen gikk på kino (Osterkamp 2008 s. 310).

Byarkeologen i Wien, Ortolf Harl, uttalte i 2001 på en internasjonal konferanse om romersk militærhistorie at “vi er så takknemlige for *Gladiator*”. Når en slik film blir sett av millioner, øker interessen merkbart for romersk historie, til tross for at historikere og arkeologer kan påpeke mange mangler og feil ved framstillingen i filmen (Marcus Junkelmann i Baumgärtner og Fenn 2004 s. 63).

Colombus-filmen *1492: Conquest of Paradise* (1992; regissert av Ridley Scott) ble kraftig kritisert av historikere, som rådet publikum til “ikke å tro på et eneste ord, faktisk heller ikke en eneste scene” (gjengitt fra Baumgärtner og Fenn 2004 s. 65).

Gladiator er en hevnfilm (“revenge movie”) (Bessières 2011 s. 118). Filmen er også et “action-epos” der alle vesentlige konflikter utspiller seg på et kroppslig nivå før de får en moralsk dimensjon (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 392-393). “In “Gladiator,” Roman show business is depicted as a series of single-elimination tournaments. Two fighters go into the arena, one comes out. Five go in, one comes out. Oops here there be tigers. Charioteers vs. infantry. How true is all this? Historically, not very, says an expert who was consulted on the movie’s script. But then, she adds, historical accuracy evidently wasn’t the point. The expert is Kathleen Coleman, professor of Latin at Harvard and the author of, among other articles, “Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments.” [...] She was shown the script (credited to David Franzoni, John Logan and William Nicholson, from a story by Franzoni. [...] Of course, says Coleman, “They were at liberty to take and disregard whatever they liked” and they disregarded quite a bit. When she saw the movie, she found “the spectacle of it all very engaging.” But as a scholar, she was disappointed. “It’s very frustrating,” she says, “that so much detail and so many fundamentals are portrayed inaccurately. But it’s still a good thing that we have a new Roman movie bringing Roman antiquity to the public consciousness.” “It doesn’t make any pretensions to historical accuracy,” says Coleman. “This is not a true story about Commodus. But, I mean, a lot of the atmosphere was designed to reflect upon modern America, I understand. And it’s really about our modern culture rather than about Roman culture. [...] Gladiators had individual skills. An ax man would not fight with a sword, nor a sword man suddenly pick up a net and trident. The net-and-trident man might fight without a helmet, as Maximus does, but no sword-and-shield man would go bareheaded, and Maximus is a sword-and-shield man. Of course, if seeing the star’s face as he fights is important, why then, out goes the helmet.” ” (http://lubbockonline.com/stories/052800/ent_052800034.shtml; lesedato 27.01.15).

Den nye keiserens prosesjon i Roma i *Gladiatoren* har påfallende likheter med nazistenes opptog i tyskeren Leni Riefenstahls propagandafilm *Viljens triumf*, med bilder som er nesten i svart-hvitt, med den geometriske ordningen av massene og den monumentale arkitekturen (Bessières 2011 s. 119).

“Ridley Scott bruker bilder som visuelt er de samme som i *Triumph des Willens* [en nazistisk propagandafilm fra 1935, regissert av tyske Leni Riefenstahl]. I disse sekvensene så svever kamera over skyene og deretter åpner skylaget seg og vi ser Roma fra fugleperspektiv med fokus på Colosseum. Det klippes til skyer og vi kan skimte solen bak skylaget. Dette er visuelt de samme som i *Triumph des Willens* med sin filming av skyer og ankomsten til Nürnberg. Det blir gjort en panorering mot en stor ørnestatue som har vingene ute og står på en triumfbue for så å panorere mot triumftoget til Keiser Commodus som ankommer Roma. Dette forsterker forbindelsen til Nazi-Tyskland og symbolbruken. Vi ser monumentale byggverk og statuer og et hav av mennesker som hyller keiserens ankomst. Ridley Scott’s versjon av Roma i denne scenen har visuelle likheter med Albert Speer’s monsterarkitektur av den planlagte verdenshovedstaden Germania i Nazi-Tyskland samt Batman’s Gotham City og Star Wars’s Coruscant.” (Håkon A. Myhra i <http://kau.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:6308/FULLTEXT01.pdf>; lesedato 08.12.15)

Malerier kan inspirere filmregissører og være ledestjerne for å gjenskape en historisk periode (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 47). Ridley Scott uttalte at *Gladiator* var mer inspirert av den britiske maleren Lawrence Alma-Tademas malerier og av den franske maleren Jean-Léon Gérômes maleri “Med en nedvendt tommel” (1872) enn av romersk arkeologi (gjengitt fra Osterkamp 2008 s. 311). Slik inspirasjon er ikke uvanlig, heller ikke fra filmer: “William Wyler studied not Roman history but other Roman movies in preparation for *Ben-Hur*” (s. 311).

Ben-Hur (1959; regissert av William Wyler) har handling fra Jerusalem et par tiår e.Kr. og ble “a massive blockbuster that won 11 Oscars, which still stands as the highest tally in history. But according to film historians, as many as 100 horses were killed during the production of the iconic film. The second-unit director of “Ben-Hur” reportedly ordered horses be shot and killed “if they limped,” without seeking veterinary care.” (<https://www.thedenverchannel.com/news/national/10-popular-movies-that-faced-claims-of-animal-abuse>; lesedato 20.06.22)

Noen scener i amerikaneren Martin Scorseses film *The Age of Innocence* (1993) framstår som “tableaux vivant” (“levende bilder” med skuespillere som står stille) og minner om malerier av franskmannen James Tissot (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 335).

Noen kritikere av kostymedramaer er svært detaljfikserte, og får vist fram sine kunnskaper gjennom å kritisere filmene. “Når filmskapere blir anklaget for slike bedrag, er gangen ofte den samme. På den ene siden ramses de historiske feilene opp av fagfolk, journalister og førstehånds kilder. På den andre siden forsvares valgene ut fra “en rett til å dramatisere” [...] Er virkeligheten virkelig så kjedelig? Er den altfor kompleks? Eller kan fiktive dramaturgiske løsninger vel så gjerne betraktes som slapt håndverk, kreativ fattigdom, og en manglende evne til å fortelle historier på en ny måte? [...] Spørsmålene vi bør stille er: Bidrar de kunstneriske

frihetene som filmskaperne tar, til å gjøre filmen bedre og mer interessant? Eller gjør de historien flatere og dummere? Sagt på en annen måte: Når vi lager film om fortiden, vil vi at fortiden skal ligne på fortidige filmer, eller at filmen skal ligne på fortiden? [...] Men sannsynligvis er det en like sterk sammenheng mellom grove historiske feil og middelmådig kunstnerisk nivå. [...] Ofte fnyser både kritikere og filmfolk av historiske faktakorreksjoner. Å dramatisere er noe annet enn å dokumentere, heter det gjerne. Men hvorfor ikke snu opp ned på holdningen? Det bør være fullt mulig å omfavne historiens kaotiske kompleksitet, ironier og mange paradokser, i stedet for å glatte over og tilpasse disse en dramaturgisk velprøvd norm.” (Ulrik Eriksen i *Morgenbladet* 9.–15. januar 2015 s. 32)

“I 2009 publiserte et knippe forskere [Butler et al. i “Using Popular Films to Enhance Classroom Learning”] et eksperiment der de hadde latt studenter lese sannferdig tekst om en historisk hendelse eller person, og så se både korrekte og oppdiktete scener fra filmer om samme emne. Eksperimentet viste at i tilfellene der klippene ble vist enten uten advarsel om at noe var oppdiktet, eller bare med en generell advarsel om det samme, så ville omtrent halvparten av studentene gjengi det oppdiktete materialet som historisk sannhet. En generell opplysning om at filmen hadde fiktive elementer, hadde altså *ingen* effekt, selv for studenter som forholdt seg til historien i en læringssituasjon.” (*Morgenbladet* 27. november–3. desember 2020 s. 41)

Publikum ønsker seg til en viss grad “stilhistorisk nøyaktighet”, særlig i filmer som ligger nær publikums egen samtid – filmer som får seerne til å sammenligne og overprøve med det de selv vet om den historiske perioden som filmen foregår i (Schroer 2007 s. 375-376). Hendelser som i sterk grad har preget “den kollektive hukommelsen”, kan ikke regissøren ta seg store friheter med uten å få negative reaksjoner. Men et historisk drama kan aldri bli en “korrekt” rekonstruksjon av de faktiske hendelsene, det er alltid et fortolkende filter mellom dengang og nå.

“Poetic licence is not a carte blanche for the wholesale disregard of facts in historical fiction or films. In most cases, getting easily determined factual details correct is not incompatible with the drama and excitement needed for a best-selling book or a success at the box office.” (Allen W. Ward sitert fra Osterkamp 2008 s. 310-311)

I artikkelen “Imagined contemporaries: Cinematic and televised dramas about the Edwardians in Great Britain and the United States, 1967-1985” av historikeren Dan L. LeMahieu (i *Historical Journal of film, radio and television*, nr. 3, 1990) blir det gitt “an interesting account of why this specific period of British history [dvs. begynnelsen av 1900-tallet] should prove popular with contemporary audiences.” (“Adaptations, heritage film & costume dramas” i <http://www.bfi.org.uk/filmtvinfo/publications/16+/pdf/costumedrama.pdf>; lesedato 14.09.11) “Though Edwardian fashion in clothes proved less visually dramatic than the regal splendour of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I, the glittering dinner parties, garden fetes, costume

parties, country weekends and general conspicuous consumption of the Edwardian upper-classes provided many opportunities for colorful display.” (LeMahieu 1990)

Om noen kostymedramaer lagd på 1960-tallet skrev LeMahieu: “Were these dramas of Edwardian life a celebration of social hierarchy and an indirect but unmistakable renunciation of the egalitarianism of the 1960s? [...] Class distinctions obsessed the Edwardians in ways that modern re-creations could either satirise or celebrate but not ignore. [...] the Edwardians discovered the high price of unquestioned nationalism when the disheartening slaughter of the First World War shattered traditional codes of social conduct. The Great War became an awful warning that later generations could contemplate both as history and as premonition. The issues of class and social hierarchy so permeated dramas about the Edwardians that some consider these productions a celebration of class distinctions. Powerful evidence supports this argument. Again and again, the social conventions of a privileged elite attract detailed, loving attention. [...] the complex lines of deference and authority within an upper-class Edwardian household. A butler and an aristocratic lady uphold standards of social conduct and personal loyalty which an attractive but sometimes wayward son threatens to undermine. Other examples of how *Upstairs, Downstairs* [fra 1970-tallet] and similar dramas glorify the class system prove not difficult to find. [...] These dramas may have been popular in the 1970s in part because they permitted audiences to glimpse the private lives of socially glamorous Edwardians while still identifying with characters and values more characteristic of the later twentieth century.” (LeMahieu 1990)

“If in these dramas the lower classes consisted of loyal domestic servants or affable eccentrics, there were also those who challenged the social system, or manipulated it successfully for their own ends. The very first episode of *Upstairs, Downstairs*, for example, centers on the stormy initiation of Sarah into the ways of the Bellamy household. Written by Fay Weldon, the episode begins with Sarah attempting to enter through the front door, before a curt hand signal from Hudson directs her to the downstairs entrance below street level. She challenges Hudson on what makes certain individuals better than others; she objects to the long hours, heavy duties and cold sleeping quarters of the domestic staff. Eventually she leaves, telling Rose that “they’re all slaves” [...]. Though she later must return under humiliating conditions, Sarah is not the only working-class character in *Upstairs, Downstairs* who demonstrates independence and autonomy.” (LeMahieu 1990)

“The dress, manners, politics, cultural taste, and social prejudices of the British upper-classes become the subject of intense scrutiny. Dramatic tension often revolves around small infringements of the social code. In a famous episode of *Upstairs, Downstairs*, for example, James Bellamy, hoping to impress his father’s attractive middle-class typist Hazel Forrest, orders the butler Hudson to serve the household’s best claret at a hastily arranged luncheon in the formal dining room. Shocked that James would countermand the orders of his father Richard, and

humiliated at the prospect of waiting on someone who is “not a lady”, Hudson threatens to resign. Although Lady Marjorie refuses to have her only son “apologise to a servant in any circumstances”, her husband Richard resents James’s treatment of a butler who everyone acknowledges to be one of the best in London. This conflict, which dominated the concluding episode of the program’s inaugural series televised in America, might easily have been played as parody. Instead, the encounter reveals and even luxuriates in the complex lines of deference and authority within an upper-class Edwardian household. A butler and an aristocratic lady uphold standards of social conduct and personal loyalty which an attractive but sometimes wayward son threatens to undermine.” (Dan L. LeMahieu i <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/01439689000260191>; lesedato 23.11.15)

“[T]he Edwardians provided contemporary audiences with historical precedents worth pondering. The struggle against traditional paternalism could not be won in a single generation. Like the attack on class privilege, the women’s movement was part of a much larger democratic revolution. Historical dramas about the Edwardians provided contemporary audiences, both male and female, with a valuable perspective that cushioned the shock of the new. Because the Edwardian period ended in the national tragedy of the First World War, these dramas addressed a third issue of enormous concern. The First World War shattered the idyll of upper-class Edwardian life. It discredited cherished nineteenth-century ideals, accelerated the economic decline of Great Britain, and, above all, decimated an entire generation of youth and promise. For modern audiences, the melancholy truths of World War One contributed another, often ironic dimension to Edwardian drama. Like the heroes of Greek tragedy, these protagonists would soon endure an event that would transform their world entirely. No matter how wealthy or secure, children of privilege would soon confront the mud and death of the Western Front. Although this fall from grace might possess special meaning to an American audience recently traumatised by the Vietnam war, it also came to possess a larger, emblematic significance. The First World War became the first of many experiences in the twentieth century of youthful idealism betrayed by political reality.” (LeMahieu 1990)

“[E]vents from the Edwardian dramas of the Seventies and Eighties help make the First World War a metaphor for pacifism. The anti-war sentiment of the 1960s helped resurrect the generation of 1914. The First World War also served another function. It became a watershed that separated the Edwardians from latter modernity. After the horrors of the Great War, the period before 1914 became a privileged sanctuary, an era of lost greatness, forever separated from the remainder of the century. Both *The Forsyte Saga* and *Upstairs, Downstairs* pursued the Edwardians into the 1920s. *The Forsyte Saga* offered a far more sympathetic portrayal of its ruthless central character in episodes dealing with post-war England. Faithful to Galsworthy’s own change of heart, Soames became a representative of the old values in a shabby world of national decline. What seemed

permanent and inexcusable about Edwardian Britain proved to be ephemeral and more forgivable after the war [...]. In *Upstairs, Downstairs*, Hudson, Mrs Bridges and Rose embody values of loyalty and service jeopardised by a more democratic post-war world. Servants leave without notice, elegant dinner parties give way to raucous gatherings of flappers, the new master James squanders his fortune on the American stockmarket, and commits suicide. The house is sold. A world has been lost [...].” (LeMahieu 1990)

“What, then, was the ideological effect of contemporary dramas about the Edwardians? With their overwhelming emphasis on the social preoccupations of a tiny élite, these productions might easily be seen as paternalistic and traditionally conservative. Yet, as we have seen, they also involved elements of egalitarianism, feminism, and pacifism that necessarily qualifies this view. These historical dramas may have been conservative, but not in the usual sense. They conserved and made more legitimate selected elements of the social agenda of the 1960s. By making social outsiders often their more sympathetic characters and, conversely, by satirising the pretensions of wealth, they demonstrated the limitations of traditional social hierarchy, as well as revealing its glamour. By dramatising the struggles of Edwardian women for greater autonomy and social respect, they provided a valuable pedigree for contemporary feminism. By vivifying the suffering and terrible costs of modern war, they affirmed the values of peace. These dramas acted as ceremonies of accommodation between a tumultuous decade and its more circumspect successor. Yet, and perhaps ironically, they also prefigured the era of Thatcher and Reagan. Dramas which assimilated the egalitarian concerns of the Left might also accommodate a populist Right. [...] Dramas which exposed the limits of paternalism might appeal to those for whom individualism and personal autonomy held special ideological meaning. Films and television programs which dwelt on an earlier, more glorious era might become relevant to a politics that sought to reverse national decline.” (LeMahieu 1990)

“It wasn’t until the 1970s and the resurgence of adaptations from nineteenth century novels that costume dramas began to engage audiences. Among the long list of adapted nineteenth century novels there were a number of Dickens’ novels including *David Copperfield* in 1974 and Jane Austen’s *Emma* in 1972. These were both produced by the BBC and thereafter the BBC began to have a major worldwide reputation for creating good quality costume drama. (Cooke, 2003, p.112) Further, Cooke argues that their emergence was in a deep sense political; ‘The cultural shift from the 1960s to the 1970s, from liberalism to conservatism and from consent to coercion, was reflected in the television drama produced during the decade. The plethora of historical dramas arguably enables an escape from the increasing bitter conflicts of 1970s Britain.’ (Cooke, 2003, pp. 112-113) Costume dramas reproduce a romantic vision of England in the late-Victorian era. They produced a place that audiences could escape to, where life is seen as simpler and to some extent easier. It is questionable whether or not these adaptations are ‘authentic’ historical reproductions. It is thought, however that it was the romantic

images that were used in the costume dramas that made them popular among audiences who used the images as a form of escapism. ‘The costume drama ... uses the exotic locale of the past as no more than a setting for romance and adventure.’ (Rosenstone, 2006, p. 45) Their popularity enabled their success to continue not only in television but also in the film industry, which was where the ‘historical drama’ flourished in the 1980s.” (<http://www.feelgdscholar.com/paper/>; lesedato 14.09.11)

“Studies of television in Britain and America reveal that the viewing public for Edwardian dramas could be astonishingly large. The first showing of the *Forsythe Saga* in 1967 drew an average audience of 700,000 viewers at a time when not all British homes could receive BBC 2. A year later, over 20 times that number – almost 16 million viewers per episode – saw the re-broadcast of the series on BBC 1, and 9 million watched a second re-broadcast in 1970. In the United States, the audience share for *The Forsythe Saga* never came close to that of Britain but, as with *Upstairs, Downstairs* later on, a share figure in America of 6% or 7% in 1975 still represented 10 or 12 million viewers. Worldwide, *Upstairs, Downstairs* became the most successful series that British television ever exported.” (LeMahieu 1990).

“The 1980s was an era that was to change the British film industry and the programmes produced for British television forever. Margaret Thatcher had taken the prime ministerial seat in 1979 and [...] film-makers held a strong oppositional and critical view of Thatcher rather than a positive one. (Quart, 1993, pp.16-17) [...] The lack of state subsidy meant even fewer people would probably want to see their films if they knew that the quality would not be as good as imported films from Hollywood due to the lack of financing. On average audiences in 1980s Britain would see one film a year and it was much more likely to be a film from Hollywood than a cheaply made British film. (Quart, 1993, p24) Therefore reducing the audience numbers overall. To try and compete internationally and on home soil (against television producers), film makers turned to another kind of film-making, away from the contemporary towards the historical: heritage films were produced again consistently and lucratively. Film-makers produced and continued to use ‘... one version of the national past as their prime selling point. Images of Britain and Britishness (usually, in fact, Englishness) became commodities for consumption in the international image market.’ (Higson, 1993, p.109) This suggests that British film-makers began to sell ideas of a national past to the international film industry as a way of escaping from Thatcher’s Britain, which was experiencing a decade when the sense of what it was to be British was being ‘viciously contested’. (Wollen, 1991, p.179): ‘The Falklands/Malvinas war in 1982 and the miner’s strike in 1984 were the most overtly political arenas where the whips of patriotism cracked....While the paths to national righteousness were cleared by Excoet and baton there was, in fictional terms at least, a disavowal of the coercion used to forge national unity.’ (Wollen, 1991, p.179) Film-makers were drawn back to a time when Britishness was something to be proud of and people

were prosperous, not unemployed and pitiful.” (<http://www.feelgdscholar.com/paper/>; lesedato 14.09.11)

På 1980- og 90-tallet noen “English costume dramas of the period seemed to articulate a nostalgic and conservative celebration of the values and lifestyles of the privileged classes [...] in doing so an England that no longer existed seemed to have been reinvented as something fondly remembered and desirable.” (Higson 2003 s. 12) Filmer kan være “glamorously nostalgic” (Higson 2003 s. 180).

En undersjanger av kostymedrama er bibelfilm. Bibelfilmen *From the Manger to the Cross* (1912) ble regissert av kanadieren Sidney Olcott og innspilt på de historiske åstedene i Israel der Jesus hadde levd (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 178). Filmen ble møtt med protester fra jødiske menigheter på grunn av den negative framstillingen av de jødiske prestene i filmen (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 180).

Undersjangeren kongefilm ble populær med den ungarsk-britiske regissøren Alexander Kordas *The Private Life of Henry VIII* (1933) (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 65). Fra 1930-tallet og utover utviklet sjangeren seg til å bli stadig mer ærbødig overfor monarkene, fra “respektløst nøkkelhull-perspektiv” til framstilling av store personligheter i nasjonenes historie, som en slags nasjonal hyllest (s. 65).

Tidlig på 1950-tallet var det i USA en sjangerbølge for ridderfilmer, med bl.a. Henry Hathaways *The Black Rose* (1950), Richard Thorpes *Ivanhoe* (1952), Thorpes *Knights of the Round Table* (1953) og Hathaways *Prince Valiant* (1954) (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 113).

Kulturarvfilm (“heritage film”) er også en undersjanger av kostymedrama. I produksjonen av kulturarvfilmer brukes i størst mulig grad ekte bygninger, gamle parker osv. Kostymer, interiører, måter å snakke og bevege seg på m.m. er til en viss grad basert på historiske kilder. Historikere som er eksperter på bygninger, klesdrakter, sosiale koder og lignende kan fungere som konsulenter når filmene produseres, slik at det meste blir historisk “korrekt”. “Heritage cinema plays a crucial role in this process of imagining English nationhood, by telling symbolic stories of class, gender, ethnicity, and identity, and staging them in the most picturesque landscapes and houses of the Old Country” (Higson 2003 s. 50). “[T]he lack of historical research behind the film is glaringly obvious” skrev en filmanmelder kritisk om en Austen-filmatisering; den filmen var dermed ikke en ekte kulturarvfilm ifølge anmelderen.

“Costume dramas or Heritage dramas, as they are also known, became part of the British art cinema, in that they straddled both the ‘traditional art house circuit and the mainstream commercial cinemas in Britain’ and additionally were thought of as culturally respectable films. As Higson states; ‘They are discussed in terms of an authorship that... is double coded – in terms of both film director and author of the source novel. Their audience is primarily middle-class and significantly older than

the mainstream film audience, and they appeal to a film culture closely allied to English literary culture and to canons of good taste... a cultural mode of production.' (1993, p.110)" (<http://www.feelgdscholar.com/paper/>; lesedato 14.09.11).

Som begynnelsen på heritage-bølgen i Storbritannia regnes Charles Sturridge m.fl. sin TV-serie *Brideshead Revisited* (1981). Cyril Cokes og Fay Weldon's 1980-adaptasjon av *Pride and Prejudice* kom imidlertid året før. Produksjonsselskapet Merchant & Ivory bidro sterkt til kulturarvfilmenes popularitet på 1980- og 1990-tallet. Men kulturarvfilmene "has been the subject of intense debate since the 1980s and has been criticised by some for its commodification of the past – for its perceived tendency to present British culture and history in a prettified and conservative package." ("Adaptations, heritage film & costume dramas" på <http://www.bfi.org.uk/filmtvinfo/publications/16+/pdf/costumedrama.pdf>; lesedato 14.09.11)

"The term 'heritage drama' was developed from the 'redeveloped' heritage industry in the 1980s. In the 1980s the 'heritage impulse' and the 'fascination with the past' meant that heritage became a 'key word in contemporary British culture.' (Higson, 2003, p.49) As Hewison wrote in 1987 the heritage industry, 'absorbs considerable public and private resources... it is expected more and more to replace the real industry upon which this country's economy depends.' (1987, p.9) The heritage industry consists of museums, libraries, manor houses and archive collections, all objects of British history and used as an image of British identity: 'At best, the heritage industry only draws a screen between ourselves and our true past... The growth of a heritage culture has led not only to a distraction of the past, but to a stifling of the culture of the present.' (Hewison, 1987, p.10) The heritage drama is a 'reconstruction' of the past and is a feature of what is termed postmodern society. Heritage dramas turn away from modernity and instead embrace nostalgia and 'the traditional'. One must recognise that the heritage drama only portrays an image of the past and is not an accurate representation of it. (Higson, 1993, p.113) '...it stands removed from history: the evocation of pastness is accomplished by a look, a style, the loving recreation of period details – not by any critical historical perspective.... They render history as spectacle, as separate from the viewer in the present.... The national past offered is above all a modern past...' (Higson, 1993, p.113)" (<http://www.feelgdscholar.com/paper/>; lesedato 14.09.11).

"The power of nostalgia lies especially in its capacity to evoke a sense of warm reassurance by bringing before our mind's eye images from a time when things seemed more secure and full of promise and possibility." (John G. Cawelti sitert fra Kaufmann 2007 s. 41) Filmer med autentiske herresetter og palasser, praktfulle interiører, berømte og verdenshistoriske personligheter som omtales eller er med i filmen osv., bidrar dessuten til nasjonalfølelsen. Britiske seere opplever i britiske kulturarvfilmer grunner til nasjonal stolthet og de bekrefter eller befester kanskje sin historisk forankrede identitet.

Chariots of Fire (1981; regissert av Hugh Hudson), som ble “a major success at the box office – also stirred up patriotic sentiments with its 1920s-set drama about class, ethnicity, national identity, and sporting achievement [...] It puts you in direct touch with sentiments so long un-expressed publicly that you wonder if they ever existed – love of country, fear of God, loyalty to the team, unselfish pursuit of honour, becoming modesty in victory, and that doesn’t by any means exhaust the list. I’d add it is a wholly English film ... if that didn’t seem in the circumstances like boastful bad form.” (Alexander Walker sitert fra Higson 2003 s. 15)

Claire Monks bok *Sex, politics and the past: Merchant Ivory, the heritage film and its critics in 1980s and 1990s Britain* (1994) vektlegger at Storbritannia i disse to tiårene “was going through political and ideological changes [...] in terms of representation on film, audiences preferred to look to Britain’s ‘great’ past than its uneasy present.” (“Adaptations, heritage film & costume dramas” på <http://www.bfi.org.uk/filmtvinfo/publications/16+/pdf/costumedrama.pdf>; lesedato 14.09.11) Monk legger fram argumentene for og imot kulturarv-filmene som samtids-/ virkelighetsflukt, og forsvarer sjangeren mot angrepene.

Patricia Rozemas 1999-adaptasjon av Austens *Mansfield Park*, annonserer i den innledende parafilm delen at filmen er “Based on Jane Austen’s novel *Mansfield Park*, her letters and her early journals”. Det er en film “where Fanny is Jane, the main character is meant to be a reflection of the novelist. This is seen in the structure and the use of sources: Fanny is a story-teller and eventually an author; she writes Austen’s *History of England*; there are quotations from Austen’s letters, juvenilia and novels. Furthermore, Fanny’s publisher is said to be Egerton; the same as Austen’s for her three first novels and the conditions the same as for Austen’s first book: at their own expence (‘of course’) and with 10 % of the profits. But in addition to this obvious identification, there is also several allusions to Austen’s life and personality. The experience of a poor girl staying in the big house of wealthy relatives are also Austen’s. Aunt Jane was a frequent visitor in her brother Edward’s stately home of Godmersham, assisting her sister-in-law with her numerous children. The feeling of dependence is one that Fanny and Jane most likely shared.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 297)

Mansfield Park (1999) er altså delvis biografisk. Det viser seg på flere måter. “‘Your tongue is sharper than a guillotine’ is Suzy’s comment when Fanny describes Lady Bertram’s opium-addiction (new in the film). This is a fitting description of Jane Austen, but it is certainly not a description of the Fanny Price of the novel, who is too shy to speak much at all. [...] Also, Rozema makes Fanny accept Henry Crawford’s proposal of marriage only to regret the next morning, in direct parallel to Jane Austen’s acceptance and rejection of Harris Bigg-Wither in 1802. And she gives her a close relationship with a sister, Susan, instead of a brother, William, as in the novel; a reminder of Jane’s closeness to her sister Cassandra. Fanny even looks like Jane. The hairstyle of the actor, Frances O’Connor, echoes Jane’s in the

famous drawing by her sister: dark curls parted in the middle (only the cap is missing in the film). And the square neckline of Fanny's dress (in the last part of the film, and on the film poster and DVD cover) is similar to Jane's in the portrait." (Sørbo 2008 s. 298) Den eldste sønnen, Tom, er langt mer sympatisk i Rozemas film enn i romanen. I filmen er han en maler og blir framstilt som en slags syndebukk for sin fars feil. I Austens roman er faren den sympatiske og sønnen en bortskjemt ødeland, i filmen er derimot faren usympatisk og Tom et lidende offer.

"Patricia Rozema's interpretive choices may be said to fill the gaps of Austen's novel when it comes to what it implied to have business-interest in Antigua in the beginning of the nineteenth century. [...] Miss Crawford's outburst that 'It is 1806 for heavens sake!' seems to be motivated by a wish to set the action to a time when Fanny could have heard cries of the slaves from a ship moored in British harbour." (Sørbo 2008 s. 313) "Rozema may well have been influenced by Edward Said's analysis of the novel in *Culture and Imperialism* from 1993." (Sørbo 2008 s. 314) Helt mot slutten av den avsluttende rulleteksten opphører den klassiske, europeiske bakgrunnsmusikken og vi hører i stedet en (slaves?) vestindiske sang.

Den mannlige hovedpersonen, Newland Archer, i amerikaneren Martin Scorseses film *The Age of Innocence* (1993) oppdager at høyborgerskapets sosiale regler er svært rigide, og dette markeres med at ansiktet hans i en scene vises bak et fuglebur (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 336). Ekstrem vekt på bordsettinger, interiører og klesdrakter signaliserer også hvordan de sosiale konvensjonene og overklassens livsstil innskrenker deres utfoldelsesmuligheter. Konvensjonene er lammende, de gir menneskene like lite mulighet til å puste og bevege seg fritt som deres klær gjør det. Maleriene på veggene i de luksuriøse hjemmene i filmen ble valgt ut med hjelp fra New York Historical Society, og en av hensiktene var at maleriene skulle karakterisere personene i filmen og deres miljø. Den kvinnelige hovedpersonen Ellen Olenska har i sin stue et maleri av en kvinne uten ansikt, som et symbol for identitetstapet i High society. Kostymedesigner Gabriella Pecucci fikk en Oscarpris for sin innsats. Personene i filmen framstår både gjennom sine klær og sin måte å bevege seg på som motiver for portrettmalere, men samtidig gir teksturen og fargene i klærne deres signaler om sanselighet og erotikk (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 337).

Spillefilmen *JFK* (1991; regissert av Oliver Stone) "has raised the issue of to what extent the past is knowable and representable. This film also stands as a perfect example of what can be seen as another possible task for the historical: to be provocative. To create a past on the screen so outrageous or controversial that it forces a society to openly debate an important historical issue. Not only did *JFK* refuel the controversy over who killed President Kennedy, it also forced Congress to pass a law declassifying tens of thousands of documents relating to the case." (Rosenstone 2006 s. 119)

Arkitektur, klær, omgangsformer osv. forandrer seg mye gjennom historien. Gamle filmer får preg av kostymedrama, selv om skuespillerne spilte i sin samtids bygninger og klesdrakter (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 9). Og uansett hvilken historisk periode handlingen foregår i, kan filmen fungere som en kommentar til samtiden da filmen ble innspilt (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 12).

I den amerikanske regissøren Sofia Coppolas film *Marie Antoinette* (2006) vises det blant alle de tidsriktige klærne og skoene plutselig, på en påfallende måte, et moderne par sko (i det kjente skomerket Converse). Dette virkemidlet brukes av regissøren for “å portrettere ens egen generasjon i historiens speil” (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 25). Coppola markerer hvilket ståsted hun har når hun ser bakover til historien. Filmen ble spilt inn i Versailles-slottet, og baserer seg delvis på historiske fakta, som at dronningen trakk seg tilbake til sitt landsted Petit Trianon der hun iscenesatte seg selv som bondekone. Marie Antoinette flykter unna virkeligheten inn i en fantasiverden. Dekoren og klesdraktene i Versailles hadde på 1700-tallet ofte kongebå og burgunderrøde farger, mens de i Coppolas film har farger inspirert av den parisiske konditoren Ladurée: en fargepalett sentrert om gult og magenta (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 416). Bakgrunnsmusikken er lagd av blant andre popgruppa The Cure.

Såkalte postmoderne kostymedramaer kan problematisere “the entire notion of historical knowledge. That foregrounds the usually concealed attitude of historians toward their material. That reeks with provisionality and undecidability, partisanship and even overt politics. That engages pulse and intellect simultaneously. That breaks down the convention of historical time and substitutes a new convention of temporality – rhythmic time. That does not aim at integration, synthesis, and totality. That is content with historical scraps. That is not the reconstruction of what has happened to us in the various phases of our lives, but a continuous playing with the memory of this. That is expressed not in coherent stories but in fragments and collage.” (Rosenstone 1995 s. 201; mange kursiver utelatt)

“What do these (real) postmodern history films do to the past? Lots of things: (1) Tell the past self-reflexively, in terms of how it means to the filmmaker historian. (2) Recount it from a multiplicity of viewpoints. (3) Eschew traditional narrative, with its beginning, middle, and end – or, following Jean-Luc Godard, insist these three elements need not necessarily be in that order. (4) Forsake normal story development, or tell stories but refuse to take the telling seriously. (5) Approach the past with humor, parody, and absurdist, surrealist, dadaesque, and other irreverent attitudes. (6) Intermix contradictory elements – past and present, drama and documentary – and indulge in creative anachronism. (7) Accept, even glory in, their own selectivity, partialism, partisanship, and rhetorical character. (8) Refuse to focus or sum up the meaning of past events, but instead make sense of them in a partial and open-ended, rather than totalized, manner. (9) Alter and invent incident and character. (10) Utilize fragmentary or poetic knowledge. (11) Never forget that

the present is the site of all past representation and knowing.” (Rosenstone 1995 s. 206-207)

Litteraturliste (for hele leksikonet): <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/litteraturliste.pdf>

Alle artiklene i leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>