

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

Kulturarvfilm

(_film, _sjanger) “Heritage film” kan på norsk kalles kulturarvfilm. En undersjanger av kostymedrama/periodedrama.

“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). “Set in the past, heritage films primarily focus on the English upper-middle class, depicting their manners and lifestyles, telling stories about their romantic entanglements and proprieties. Particularly, these films are marked by their visual splendour and period authenticity with the display of magnificent English country-houses, the picturesque landscape of southern England and luxurious interior décors which to some extent have become major attractions of the genre” (Yingjie Fu i http://othes.univie.ac.at/10101/1/2010-05-18_0506531.pdf; lesedato 05.11.15). Filmene har detaljerte “set designs” (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 121), og tematiserer ofte nasjonal identitet, sosial klasse og kjønnsroller (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 313).

“[H]eritage films have an emphasised display of picturesque landscapes, lovely costumes and great houses. Higson writes that the style of the camera is pictorialist “with all the connotations the term brings of art-photography, aesthetic refinement, and set-piece images.” He further observes that heritage cinema is not so much interested in story-telling as in the landscapes, their properties, actors, props and archaic dialogue. Carola Surkamp also points out that these movies indicate certain artistry and carry out an aesthetic function rather than the narrative.” (Bojana Perišić i <https://www.gbz.hu-berlin.de/downloads/pdf/master-thesis-perisic>; lesedato 03.11.15)

Det sentrale i kulturarvfilmer er viljen til historisk nøyaktighet og detaljrikdom. Hvis en roman som foregår overklassemiljø i Irland på 1760-tallet skal filmatiseres, må bygninger, interiør, klesdrakter, hagedesign osv. være slik det så ut der på 1760-tallet. Alt velges nøye ut, noe som fordyrer produksjonen. Filmen skal ha historisk troverdighet og det skal ikke foretas vesentlige praktiske snarveier som innebærer at det historisk autentiske preget blir borte. Bygninger, møbler, tapeter, smykker, frisyre, sosiale manerer m.m. må være basert på historiske kilder, og helst være

autentiske historiske gjenstander. Samarbeid med museer og historikere er nødvendig for å få produksjonen i havn. Filmene kan likevel bli kritisert for å være “uhistoriske”, f.eks. fordi alle personene er påfallende vakkert kledd. Dessuten er de fleste, også kroppsarbeidere, i stand til å formulere seg slående elegant og presist. Og det er knapt noen råtne tenner å se, noe som er relativt uhistorisk.

I mange tilfeller er filmene adaptasjoner av romaner, og filmene “recreate with anthropological zeal the fashions and objects of the periods in which the original novels were set.” (Vidal 2012 s. 10) “[A]rchitectural sites, interior designs, furnishings and, in general, the *mise-en-scène* of objects, settings and period artefacts become not just a conduit for narrative and characterisation but carry an ideological effect: they help construct a sense of Englishness according to a certain bourgeois ideal of imperial tradition, stability and propriety that belies the subtler ironies of the novels faithfully adapted. The heritage film would thus encourage a nostalgic look back to the certainties and the visual splendour of the national past.” (Vidal 2012 s. 9) Seerne skal få oppleve “a pure, untainted, traditional Englishness” (Higson 2003 s. 154).

Handlingen viser “in extraordinary detail the social conventions and sometimes tragic predicaments of an era distant enough to invoke nostalgia [...] The dress, manners, politics, cultural taste, and social prejudices of the British upper-classes become the subject of intense scrutiny.” (LeMahieu 1990) Filmene kan være “a vehicle for escapist nostalgia” (Vidal 2012 s. 55). I mange filmer brukes det “a reassuring iconography of English tradition characterised by pastoral, upper-class lifestyles and a largely uncritical use of images of empire.” (Vidal 2012 s. 4)

Filmene har blitt kritisert for å være “nostalgic, obsessed with the past ... feeding illusions of stability in an unstable world [...] repeatedly turn[ing] away from our contemporary realities [...] an idealised, bucolic past, with pastoral images [...] a world of taste and order ... dignified and refined” (Derek Jarman og James Wood sitert fra Higson 2003 s. 70). “The effort to achieve period authenticity, the heritage impulse, frequently seems to recreate the past as the perfect nostalgic place. The satirical narrative on the other hand must disturb the sense of perfection, upset the pleasing heritage package.” (Higson 2003 s. 82)

“[T]hose films looked nostalgically to the past. [...] The nostalgic vision, it was argued, imagined a time when England was great, and was peopled by lovable upper-class eccentrics. It was a privileged class vision of the national past, secured in images of exclusive and private heritage property. Erased from this vision, it was argued, were all the problems of class exploitation, patriarchy, and imperialism. [...] that which in the source narratives is abhorrent or problematic often becomes prettified, elegant, and seductive in the films. Even those films which develop an ironic narrative of the past often seem to end up celebrating and legitimating the spectacle of one class and one cultural tradition and identity at the expense of

others through the discourse of authenticity, and the obsession with the visual splendours of period detail.” (Higson 2003 s. 80)

“The class focus of most of the films set before the nineteenth century is as circumscribed as those set in later periods. For the most part, they deal with monarchs, nobility, or aristocrats, and it is difficult to find films that step confidently away from the privileged classes. [...] so-called heritage cinema would seem to focus on a highly circumscribed set of traditions, those of the privileged, white, Anglo-Saxon community who inhabit lavish properties in a semi-rural southern England, within striking distance of the metropolitan seat of power.” (Higson 2003 s. 26-27)

“The heritage film has period settings (typically, Edwardian England or the British Raj), recurrent locations (the English countryside, Oxbridge, colonial India, Italy), slow-paced narratives that enhance character and the authenticity of period detail, and an opulent if static mise-en-scène exhibiting elaborate period costumes, artefacts, properties and heritage sites. The heritage film typically dwells on an iconography of upper-middle class and aristocratic privilege. [...] such iconography produces a highly selective vision of Englishness attached to pastoral and imperial values where the past as spectacle becomes the main attraction.” (Vidal 2012 s. 8) Filmene kan “make white middle-class audiences feel safe, happy, content and unchallenged” (Higson 2003 s. 186).

“The key to the type of English acting that such roles call for is of course understatement and restraint, in which the tiniest of gestures can speak volumes, although careful diction counts for much too. There is thus a kind of performative overdetermination in many of these roles. [...] The roles are class-bound, of course, and bring with them all the cultural requirements of reserve and repression, but also a superficial self-confidence and charisma. On the other hand, the sense of performance, the sense of masquerade, is paramount. Englishness, or rather a certain model of Englishness, is thus presented as a role, an act” (Higson 2003 s. 32).

Handlingen i den østerriksk-amerikanske regissøren Erich von Stroheims film *The Wedding March* (1928) foregår i Wien i 1914. Det ble lagd nøyaktige kopier av østerrikske uniformer til innspillingen, og en transportvogn som keiser Ferdinand faktisk hadde eid og brukt, ble sendt til USA for å brukes under filmingen (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 54).

Som begynnelsen av heritage-bølgen i Storbritannia regnes av mange 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, ifølge Marie Nedregotten Sørbø (2008 s. 148). Kulturarvfilmene viser primært overklassens liv, med et luksuriøst preg (“grand

style”). Norske filmer med gjenskaping av f.eks. bygårdsliv i Christiania eller husmannsmiljøer på bygda regnes derfor vanligvis ikke som kulturarvfilmer, men dette er diskutabelt. Filmene er dessuten ofte serier der handlingen foregår i relativt langsomt tempo. Denne langsomheten gir en realisme-effekt.

Filmene er “more gently paced than most mainstream films. The narratives of most of these films are typically slow-moving, episodic, and de-dramatized; that is to say, they do not normally adopt the efficient and economic causal development of the classical film, or its fast pace and narrative energy. They are also frequently organized around several central protagonists, which encourages both a more dispersed narrative structure than most hero-focused classical films, and an emphasis on ensemble performance. With dramatic, goal-directed action downplayed, this narrative structure typically creates a space in which character, place, atmosphere, and milieu can be explored.” (Higson 2003 s. 37)

“ ‘Heritage film’ as a genre has been highly contested. Coined by Charles Barr to refer to British wartime cinema (see Voigts-Virchow *Corset Wars* 14), the term ‘heritage film’ has gained a certain currency as a means of describing a group of British period films produced in the 1980s and 1990s. [...] For all their superficial stability, heritage films seem very often to deal with an identity crisis or ideological conflict, or in other words, “the last of old England” (Higson *English Heritage* 28).” (Yingjie Fu i http://othes.univie.ac.at/10101/1/2010-05-18_0506531.pdf; lesedato 05.11.15)

“Typified by films such as *A Room with a View* (1985) and *Howards End* (1992), the heritage text was commonly understood as a film that drew upon a work of classic literature, dwelt upon the lives and properties of the upper classes and was set roughly in the period between 1860 and World War Two. The so-called ‘heritage debate’ that ensued amongst scholars of British film culture initially called attention to their political implications, with some commentators deeming them to be nostalgic and conservative within the context of reactionary Thatcherite ideology. But further analysis, prompted by feminist and gay readings, led to more nuanced and varied positions on their gender politics, their appeal to audiences, their umbilical link with the ‘heritage’ industries and their generic delineation and coherence.” (Leggott 2008 s. 81)

Filmene har vanligvis “a view from above, conservative, upper-class, patriarchal” (Higson 2003 s. 28). “[T]he heritage film has been accused of mythologising (and misrepresenting) the national past via a stable and conservative iconography.” (Vidal 2012 s. 47) “One strand of the debate about ‘British’ heritage films involves dismissing them on class grounds, from a leftist perspective: these are conservative films for middle-class audiences, and they function to maintain the values and interests of the most privileged social strata. According to such accounts, audiences are invited to escape from the cultural heterogeneity of contemporary Britain by celebrating a class and an ethnicity apparently secure in its self-knowledge and self-

sufficiency. From a traditional, conservative perspective, however, the same films seem charming, precisely because they are traditional and conservative, precisely because that class and its culture are fascinating and worthy.” (Higson 2003 s. 46-47)

“[T]he films themselves are structured in such a way that they invite competing readings from their audiences, one appropriate to the image track, the other to the narrative line. If this is the case, no wonder then that some read the films as conservative (concentrating above all on the iconography) and others read them as liberal (foregrounding the narrative concerns of the film).” (Higson 2003 s. 85)

Andrew Higson har hevdet at kulturarvfilmene lagd på 1980-tallet er “above all, nostalgic films [...] they should be read as conservative responses to the particular modernity – or the post-modernity – of the 1980s, instances of conservative patriotic escapism, wistful constructions of an ideal homeland that was both parochial and imperialist, and that was of course situated in the past [...] At the level of their narratives, it seemed to me, films like *Chariots of Fire*, *A Room with a View* and *Howards End* actually offered some sort of liberal critique of the class-bound, mono-cultural and patriarchal societies that were represented on screen. But at the level of the image, at the level of the lovingly created *mise-en-scène* of the national past, these films seemed to invite a conservative nostalgic gaze which overwhelmed the narrative critique, a loving, desiring gaze that celebrated the vision of the past on offer. Various other commentators suggested that these same films could be read very differently – not least as celebrations of a particular sort of female culture, a feminine resistance to certain patriarchal tenets.” (Higson 2014). Filmene er “addressed primarily to older, more female, and more upmarket audiences” (Higson 2003 s. 106).

“As Andreas Huyssen points out, however, there remains a felt need for a sense of past-ness and historicity, since the search for tradition is such a vital feature of the contemporary response to the felt failure of modernism.” (Higson 2003 s. 64)

I engelske kulturarvfilmer “the upper-middle-class and upper-class past is displayed in a beguilingly realist manner, in the sense that the *mise-en-scène* is replete with apparently authentic historical detail. It is at the same time very often a spectacular display, thanks to the high production values employed and the attention paid to production design.” (Higson 2014)

Regissørene har det overordnede ansvaret for å “establish an authentic reconstruction of the English past [...] On the one hand, lavish period spectacle is one of the pleasures of such films. On the other hand, it invites criticism for a nostalgic, uncritical, prettified view of the past.” (Higson 2014)

“Painterly compositions have become a distinctive (and almost clichéd) marker of the heritage film since the 1990s. The increasingly composite nature of locations

and the new possibilities afforded by digital postproduction permit the enhanced use of an eclectic mixture of painterly references as part of a unified approach to style.” (Vidal 2012 s. 114)

“[W]e are faced with the problem of period spectacle. If this is one of the pleasures of such films, it also invites criticism for a nostalgic or celebratory view of aristocratic life. One easyCinema website user may have commented that “It would be difficult to make a film of this book without it looking great in terms of location & scenery – this film conveys very well the sumptuous other-worldliness of the Flytes lifestyle, which made it so enticing.” [...] time to linger [...] time to admire the heritage display [...] time to dwell nostalgically on images and characters.” (Higson 2014)

Noen filmer fra før 1980-tallet kan kanskje oppfattes som kulturarvfilmer på grunn av alle de historiske korrekte detaljene. 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).

Den britiske kulturhistorikeren Robert Hewison ga i 1987 ut boka *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline*. “In the late 1980s English academic Robert Hewison coined the phrase ‘heritage industry’ to describe what he considered to be the sanitisation and commercialisation of the version of the past produced as heritage in the UK. He suggested that heritage was a structure largely imposed from above to capture a middle-class nostalgia for the past as a golden age in the context of a climate of decline. Hewison believed that the rise of heritage as a form of popular entertainment distracted its patrons from developing an interest in contemporary art and critical culture, providing them instead with a view of culture that was finished and complete (and firmly in the past). [...] In the face of apparent decline and disintegration, it is not surprising that the past seems a better place. [...] His book *The Heritage Industry* is as much a reflection on the changes that occur within a society as a result of deindustrialisation, globalisation and transnationalism (in particular, the impact of rapid and widespread internal migration and immigration on the sense of ‘rootedness’ that people could experience in particular places in the UK in the 1980s, and the nostalgia that he saw as a response to this sense of uprootedness) as it is a criticism of heritage itself. [...] “The nostalgic impulse is an important agency in adjustment to crisis, it is a social emollient and reinforces national identity when confidence is weakened or threatened.” (Hewison, 1987, p. 47)” (<http://www.open.edu/openlearn/history-the-arts/history/heritage/what-heritage/content-section-3.1>; lesedato 05.07.16)

“The academic Patrick Wright had published a book some two years earlier than *The Heritage Industry* titled *On Living in an Old Country* (1985). Like Hewison, Wright was concerned with the increasing ‘museumification’ of the UK, and the ways in which heritage might act as a distraction from engaging with the issues of the present. Wright argued that various pieces of heritage legislation that were put forward by the Conservative government could be read as the revival of the patriotism of the Second World War, and connected this Conservative patriotism to the events of the Falklands conflict. Like Hewison, he was also critical of the ‘timelessness’ of the presentation of the past formed as part of the interpretation of heritage sites: “National heritage involves the extraction of history – of the idea of historical significance and potential – from a denigrated everyday life and its restaging or display in certain sanctioned sites, events, images and conceptions. In this process history is redefined as ‘the historical’, and it becomes the object of a similarly transformed and generalised public attention ... Abstracted and redeployed, history seems to be purged of political tension; it becomes a unifying spectacle, the settling of all disputes. Like the guided tour as it proceeds from site to sanctioned site, the national past occurs in a dimension of its own – a dimension in which we appear to remember only in order to forget.” (Wright, 1985, p. 69) These critiques of heritage in the UK centred on the ways in which heritage distracted people from engaging with their present and future. [...] We can see the growth of heritage in the second part of the twentieth century as, at least in part, a reaction to the way in which globalisation, migration and transnationalism had begun to erode the power of the nation-state. In this guise, heritage is primarily about establishing a set of social, religious and political norms that the nation-state requires to control its citizens, through an emphasis on the connection between its contemporary imposition of various state controls and the nation’s past.” (<http://www.open.edu/openlearn/history-the-arts/history/heritage/what-heritage/content-section-3.1>; lesedato 05.07.16)

“Hewison’s position was criticised by a series of commentators. The British Marxist historian Raphael Samuel noted in *Theatres of Memory* (1994) that [...] heritage and ‘the past’ had been successfully lobbied as a catch-cry for a range of political positions and interests; in particular, heritage had served to make the past more democratic, through an emphasis on the lives of ‘ordinary’ people. He also saw the roots of popular interest in the past as stretching back far earlier than the political era of ‘decline’ suggested by Hewison: “The new version of the national past, notwithstanding the efforts of the National Trust to promote a country-house version of ‘Englishness’, is inconceivably more democratic than earlier ones, offering more points of access to ‘ordinary people’, and a wider form of belonging. Indeed, even in the case of the country house, a new attention is now lavished on life ‘below the stairs’ (the servants’ kitchen) while the owners themselves (or the live-in trustees) are at pains to project themselves as leading private lives – ‘ordinary’ people in ‘family’ occupation. Family history societies, practising do-it-yourself scholarship and filling the record offices and the local history library with

searchers, have democratized genealogy, treating apprenticeship indentures as a symbolic equivalent of the coat of arms, baptismal certificates as that of title deeds. They encourage people to look down rather than up in reconstituting their roots, ‘not to establish links with the noble and great’ ... ” (Samuel, 1994, p. 160)” (<http://www.open.edu/openlearn/history-the-arts/history/heritage/what-heritage/content-section-3.2>; lesedato 05.07.16)

“As Roger Sales suggests, the presence of servants may also reveal the precarious position of the leisured classes, since they often witness the less salutary aspects of their employers’ behaviour. In many more cases, however, servants seem to figure as little more than authentic period props, heritage decoration – and may in that respect underline the pleasures of the leisured classes they serve. Despite the caveats, then, most of the costume dramas cited seem fascinated by the private property, the culture, and the values of a very limited class fraction in each period depicted, those with inherited or accumulated wealth and cultural capital, and in close proximity to those with political power. The national past and national identity emerge in these films as very much bound to the upper and upper middle classes, while the nation itself is often reduced to the soft pastoral landscape of southern England, rarely tainted by the modernity of urbanization or industrialization – although we do see evidence of the latter in the [Christine] Edzard films, *Howards End*, *Jude*, and *The Wings of the Dove*, for instance. [...] the quality of the films lends the representation of the past a certain cultural validity and respectability. But there is no escaping the reductiveness of the particular cultures and sets of traditions that stand in for the English national past. Private interest in effect becomes naturalized as in the public interest. Except, of course, that these are still films for a relatively privileged audience. [...] Audiences who engage with these representations must in some degree negotiate their ideas of England and Englishness in relation to these representations. This does not mean that all audiences who engage with these representations automatically buy in to a particular mythology of the old country and national identity; but if they do not, then they must actively resist such representations and seek to create an alternative mythology.” (Higson 2003 s. 27)

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)

I *Howards End* (1992; regissert av James Ivory) og *The Wings of the Dove* (1997; regissert av Iain Softley) “it is the liberal-humanist focus on caring personal relationships which is valued over the efforts to secure inheritance and maintain social power. From this perspective, the films can seem culturally quite progressive. This is clearly how James Ivory would like us to interpret his various ‘English’ films, which, he explains, were ‘fired as much by skepticism and indignation as by affection and admiration’. He is therefore incensed by critics who view the Merchant Ivory films as reactionary, as nostalgic for a class-bound vision

of the English past. Claire Monk agrees, arguing that these are not conservative films, but films shot through with ‘liberal pleasures’, focusing on the personal, on love, romance, and friendship, and on social transgression in one form or another. Some of the films, she suggests, work as satires or comedies of manners, demonstrating a sense of irony; others work as melodramas that expose social injustice. [...] Jeffrey Richards, on the other hand, focuses on the way heritage films seem to challenge a deep-rooted, class-bound version of national identity. Such films, he argues, provide a ‘comprehensive critique of the ethic of restraint, repression and the stiff upper lip, of the surrender of personal happiness to higher notions of duty and self-sacrifice, hitherto key elements of the national character’.” (Higson 2003 s. 72-73) De viser ofte “snobbery and greed” (Higson 2003 s. 185).

“Heritage film allegedly represents English national identity or so-called ‘Englishness’ mainly through returning to the ‘past’, for “collectivity has its roots in the past” (Weil, qtd. in Lowenthal 44). However, it is noteworthy that, as Giddings observes, the ‘past’ with which heritage film seems particularly concerned is the nineteenth century: “a major warehouse of historical commodities and evidence, and a period still almost within living memory in which culture we feel we have strong roots” (qtd. in Whelehan 12). There seems to be a consensus among many leading authorities that it is only after the eighteenth century that the ‘past’ became romanticized and integral to the sense of English identity, which means that something remarkable happened to, and fundamentally changed, the national character at the turn of the centuries. Harold Perkin, a social historian, points out that : “Between 1780 and 1850 the English ceased to be one of the most aggressive, brutal, rowdy, outspoken, riotous, cruel and bloodthirsty nations in the world and became one of the most inhibited, polite, orderly, tender-minded, prudish and hypocritical” (qtd. in Richards 5). [...] features like gentle, decent, sentimental, deep sense of duty and emotional restraint which are traditionally represented as English virtues, are basically “cultural artefacts” (Richards 1) of the nineteenth century” (Yingjie Fu i http://othes.univie.ac.at/10101/1/2010-05-18_0506531.pdf; lesedato 10.11.15) De britiske filmene prøver ofte å gjenskape “an era of British social and political hegemony” (LeMahieu 1990).

“In so many ways, for all their elegance and allure, heritage films seem very often to deal with the last of England, or at least the last of old England. In films like *A Passage to India*, the focus is on the end of empire. Elsewhere, it is the death of liberal England (*Regeneration*), the betrayal of the nation (*Another Country*), the corrupt decadence and moral decay of the upper classes (*Angels and Insects*, *Another Country*, *A Handful of Dust*, *The Shooting Party*, *The Clandestine Marriage*), or the displacement of the aristocracy by a new meritocracy (*Chariots of Fire*). The idea of heritage implies a sense of inheritance, but it is precisely that which is on the wane in these films. Several films thus focus on a crisis of inheritance among the privileged classes, or the threat of disinheritance. The problem is generally posed as a question: who is to inherit or, to put it more metaphorically, who is to occupy the centre ground?” (Higson 2003 s. 28) Mange

av filmene “seem interrogative and critical, exploring the underside of the often nostalgic vision” (Higson 2003 s. 28). “[S]omewhat paradoxically, they also seem to offer decidedly conservative, nostalgic, and celebratory visions of the English past – and it is difficult to argue convincingly that the majority do not still, despite the evidence of the above, dwell on the privileged lifestyle and visible evidence of wealth of the leisured classes.” (Higson 2003 s. 29)

På 1980-tallet kom det en rekke filmatiseringer av Jane Austens romaner, filmer som tydelig inngår i sjangeren “heritage films”: tidsriktige kostymer, bruk av gamle herregårder (“estates”, “mansions”) med gamle interiører, landskap som fra “det gamle England”, mest mulig tidsriktig språk og gester, osv. “Earlier costume dramas tended to feature romantic, adventurous or melodramatic stories against a period background, without bothering too much with fidelity. Heritage films, by contrast, concentrate on the careful display of historically accurate dress, and decor, producing what one might call a ‘museum aesthetic’ ” (Ginette Vincendeau sitert fra Hudelet 2006 s. 99). Filmene har en “culturally refined, object-venerating museum aesthetic” (Higson 2003 s. 238). Det kan i noen ekstreme tilfeller kalles en “arkeologisk” tilnærming (Worth 1983 s. 8).

Et eksempel på en Austen-filmatisering som *ikke* er en heritage-film, er Robert Z. Leonards *Pride and Prejudice* (1940). I denne filmen går ikke personene i empire-klær, snarere i klær i *Tatt av vinden*-stil. Det er altså vesentlige forskjeller mellom romanens historiske setting og 1940-filmen. Det er også ulike person-framstillinger i roman og film: “[I]n the 1940 film, the line ‘I never knew myself’ seems to refer to her awakening romantic interest in Darcy, rather than to her discovery of her own prejudice” (Sørbø 2008 s. 155). Elizabeths selvbekreftelser er generelt gjort mye mildere i alle filmadaptasjonene enn de er i roman (Sørbø 2008 s. 155-156).

“[P]opular Austen continues to be promoted by a culture industry that has appropriated the novels for English heritage, reproducing in fetishised detail the ‘lost’ graces of pre-industrial England for an audience still hungry for Austen’s incarnation of the romance.” (Tauchert 2005 s. 9) Filmene skal skape “a spectacular feel that is closely related to the use of heritage properties” (Higson 2003 s. 227).

“One significant part of the heritage industry is the production and release of the so called ‘heritage movies’. They became particularly popular during the 1980s, were successful in the 1990s and they still attract audiences at the beginning of the 21st century. On the whole, they are famous for producing feelings of aesthetic pleasure through elaborate screening of the dazzling landscapes and lavish costume props. They mostly deal with affairs and entanglements of the pre-industrial English upper classes (and are nevertheless considered as representations of the nation) and are often based on classic works of literature. Among the British writers whose works have been adapted to film (such as William Shakespeare, Oscar Wilde, Virginia Woolf, Charles Dickens, Thomas Hardy and E.M. Forster), Jane Austen has been particularly embraced by the producers in the last decades.” (Bojana Perišić i

<https://www.gbz.hu-berlin.de/downloads/pdf/master-thesis-perisic>; lesedato 03.11.15)

En nasjonal “feeling of belonging certainly needs to be consolidated and fortified by particular mental pictures and ideas of the members of an imagined community. A movie represents a very powerful and effective mode of achieving this stabilisation. Movies “provide not only stories of national unity, of belonging, and stable internal and external boundaries but also have immediate visual impact.” It is rather obvious that heritage films promote an image of Englishness. However, this image is restricted only to upper classes and rural parts of the country. England is seen as a land of beautiful landscapes and houses, well-mannered and classy people. This picture is very distant from the multicultural and multinational modern England. That is the reason why some critics argue that the 1990s revival of interest in Austen is a part of a kind of nostalgic effort to reclaim whiteness. Apart from maintaining an embellished picture of Englishness in the eyes of the public, the heritage films present an important part of the heritage and tourism industry. They provide great promotional material for the attractive sights of England. People who saw the movies and enjoyed their visual splendour, frequently want to see the beauties of English landscapes and country houses themselves.” (Bojana Perišić i <https://www.gbz.hu-berlin.de/downloads/pdf/master-thesis-perisic>; lesedato 06.11.15)

“The country house was a favoured symbol for conservative commentators who could use it to stand for a stable, hierarchically ordered society which symbolised the “English character.” In the country house the Right promoted a set of “virtues” as intrinsically English and associated them with a period of national “success.” [...] the symbolic centrality of the country house” (Mike Crang i https://www.researchgate.net/publication/30049418_Placing_Jane_Austen_displacing_England_Touring_between_book_history_and_nation; lesedato 08.12.20). Filmer kan “reinforce well-established cultural hierarchies based around taste and national identity” (Higson 2003 s. 165).

“A rapidly expanding Heritage industry greeted these visitors from overseas [amerikanske turister i Storbritannia]. In 1985, Britain could boast of over 2000 museums, with almost half founded since 1971. On average, a new museum opened every two weeks during the 1970s. In 1984/85, two-thirds of all foreign tourists visited these museums or historic sites including over 200 country houses owned either privately or by a growing number of national organisations. “No sane person comes to Britain for the weather or the beaches”, the *New York Times* explained in 1988, “They come to see the palaces and the stately homes They come for the heritage. That is especially true for Americans and visitors from former outposts of the British empire, whose language, roots and culture owe so much to England” ” (LeMahieu 1990).

“The mutual influence of the film and tourist industries has furthered a specifically British critique that is deeply suspicious of the visual and narrative pleasures found in the artefacts and practices of the heritage industry.” (Vidal 2012 s. 15) Filmene skaper grunnlag for “forms of retro-tourism” (Vidal 2012 s. 15).

“The idea of national heritage involves the notions of democracy and equality, since every member of one nation enjoys a right to it. Due to the incalculable value of these attributes, a national heritage is something worth preserving; it is a resource from which everyone can benefit. This brings us to the core of the *English Heritage* organisation, which is “the Government’s statutory adviser on the historic environment.” [...] *English Heritage* uses the buildings which are the vital elements in constructing the nation. They try to make the sometime exclusive aristocratic homes and estates widely available. Interestingly, just like Austen’s films, they also provide access only to the higher classes’ way of life, neglecting the history of those who belonged to the lower social ranks and constituted the majority of the nation. The main goal and the idea of all the work of *English Heritage* is explained in the following paragraph: “The historic environment is a resource from which everyone can benefit and is a fundamental tool for regeneration, sustaining community pride, supporting small businesses, creating a sense of identity and belonging and reaching out to and educating the next generation.” In this small manifesto one can recognise the idea of equality and benefit [...]. The other important notions would be a ‘sense of identity’ and ‘educating’. Last but not the least, the financial function (‘businesses’), or making a profit, is also important.” (Bojana Perišić i <https://www.gbz.hu-berlin.de/downloads/pdf/master-thesis-perisic>; lesedato 03.11.15)

“Derek Jarman suggested that heritage films were “nostalgic, obsessed with the past ... feeding illusions of stability in an unstable world” (qtd. in Higson *English Heritage* 70). Stephen Frears dismissed the genre of heritage film as “the rattling of teacups” (qtd. in Fuller 37). Even more provocative was Hanif Kureishi’s statement that heritage film was “the sort of soft-sore [*sic*] saccharine confection that Tory ladies and gentlemen think is Art” [...] Escaping from the cultural heterogeneity of contemporary Britain, heritage films are criticized for “[turning] their backs on the industrialized, chaotic present” and for “nostalgically [reconstructing] an imperialist and upper-class Britain” (Higson *Re-presenting* 110). Thus, from a leftist perspective, heritage films “are conservative films for middle-class audiences, and they function to maintain values and interests of the most privileged social strata” (Higson *English Heritage* 46).” (qtd. In Higson *English Heritage* 71).” (Yingjie Fu i http://othes.univie.ac.at/10101/1/2010-05-18_0506531.pdf; lesedato 06.11.15)

“[S]ocial and cultural traditions are exposed as repressive; privilege is revealed as exploitation. So many of the films insistently scratch away at the idea of an essential England, noting the instability, the flux in identity, the hybrid quality of Englishness. Many of the films also dramatize the dissolution of a particular

version of England and Englishness, the decay and the decadence of aristocratic life and its hold on the reins of power, or the loss of inheritance. In this sense, the narratives of the films seem much more radical, questioning the desirability of the lifestyle of those who inhabit these spaces.” (Higson 2003 s. 77)

“[W]here the narratives often seem to encourage a critique of privilege and tradition, and to acknowledge cultural fluidity, impermanence, and change, the visuals equally often seem to encourage a nostalgic delight in images of wealth and antiquity. At the level of the image, narrative instability is frequently overwhelmed by the alluring spectacle of iconographic stability, permanence, and grandeur, providing an impression of an unchanging, traditional, and always delightful and desirable England. This is Heritage England, where social difference, but also the possibility of making connections across social boundaries, is replaced by social deference, each person in their allotted place and transgression forbidden. The attention to visual pleasure, and to spectacular displays of the iconography of the past, can trouble even the most self-consciously liberal films” (Higson 2003 s. 78).

“As with so many of the heritage films, it is this ambivalence that fascinates me, this tension between the *narrative* critique of established national traditions, social formations, and identities, and the *visual* celebration of elite culture and a mythic landscape. On the one hand, the various characters in *Howards End* are played as solid English types, reproducing a certain notion of Englishness, apparently stable, confident, and secure in its identity. On the other hand, the story explores tensions and slippages in this identity, it explores identity crises, by probing beneath the mannered surface and throwing characters from different backgrounds into confrontation with each other. England thus becomes a seething mass of tensions, in which no one’s identity seems pure or stable or authentic.” (Higson 2003 s. 149-150)

Mange filmer har blitt kritisert “by the more politically concerned critics as bolstering an unacceptably exploitative social system. The more sympathetic might note simply that the film ‘studiously attacks the greed and heartlessness of the rich while quite happily revelling in their splendid lifestyle’.” (Higson 2003 s. 185) Det som har blitt kalt “familiar ingredients of the heritage film”, er “the narrative revelations about the seedy underside to the aristocratic veneer; the sense of class exploitation; the transgressive, cross-class sexual relationships; the ennui and eccentricity of the financially troubled upper classes; aristocratic concerns about society interlopers – Americans, media types, ‘new money’; and so on.” (Higson 2003 s. 257)

“From the perspective of this leftist cultural critique, the heritage film as pastiche reduces each period of the national past through a process of reiteration to an effortlessly reproducible, and attractively consumable, connotative style.” (Higson 2003 s. 65)

“The films usually focus on character developments and therefore do not have the need to push the narrative forward. This is why their aesthetics is different from mainstream Hollywood. The editing and camerawork often create a slow and graceful rhythm. This is achieved with a lot of long shots and the lack of quick, dramatic cutting. The movement of the camera is very fluid and slow. Instead of following characters, it is frequently motivated by the desire to offer spectator a better look to the period setting, objects and costumes. The slow editing work is complemented by the non-violent stories, impeccable manners and the soothing soundtrack. The plots of the heritage films are in some way involved with the everyday life of the upper classes. They deal with love stories, family relationships and social issues.” (Bojana Perišić i <https://www.gbz.hu-berlin.de/downloads/pdf/master-thesis-perisic>; lesedato 03.11.15)

Howards End (1992; regissert av James Ivory) “is less goal-driven or organized around the causal logic of action sequences than it is driven by a desire to explore character and ambience, period detail and manners. [...] The slowness of the film is in part a function of its realism, and the film-makers’ bid for authenticity. [...] emphasis on character rather than action.” (Higson 2003 s. 171)

Howards End har “attention to domestic detail. In addition to that ubiquitous silver, the film also makes abundant use of antique china and crystal, potted palms, leather-bound volumes, lace anti-macassars and elaborate period costumes for its interior shots, not to mention the vintage cars and trains, striking architecture, wicker furniture and luxuriant flower gardens that add color to its outdoor scenes. [...] James Ivory: ‘Sometimes you have to be careful that the surroundings don’t distract from what’s going on ... Other times you can lay it on with a trowel, and you should ... That’s part of the production value of a movie.’ ” (Higson 2003 s. 188)

“The decoupage and the camerawork tend towards the languid. There is a preference for long takes and deep staging, for instance, and for long and medium shots, rather than for close-ups and rapid or dramatic cutting. The camera is characteristically fluid, but camera movement often seems dictated less by a desire to follow the movement of characters than by a desire to offer the spectator a more aesthetic angle on the period setting and the objects which fill it.” (Higson 2003 s. 38)

Spillefilmen *Elizabeth* (1998; regissert av Shekhar Kapur) hadde ikke andre kulturarvfilmers rolige tempo: “The speed of developments and the constant bustle of activity leave no room for the camera to caress period details.” (Higson 2003 s. 226)

Det er vanlig med “countryside travelling sequences shot from carriages or horseback (modes of transport that accentuate the ‘pastness’ of the landscape) and

interior scenes orchestrated around ritualised acts such as afternoon tea or the social ball” (Vidal 2012 s. 30).

“Heritage culture appears petrified, frozen in moments that virtually fall out of the narrative, existing only as adornments for the staging of a love story. Thus, from this point of view, historical narrative is transformed into spectacle; heritage becomes excess, not functional *mise-en-scène*, not something to be used narratively, but something to be admired. All in all, the camera style is pictorialist, with all the connotations the term brings of art-photography, aesthetic refinement, and set-piece images. Though narrative meaning and narrational clarity are rarely sacrificed, these shots, angles, and camera movements frequently seem to exceed narrative motivation. The effect is to transform narrative space into heritage space: that is, a space for the display of heritage properties rather than for the enactment of dramas. In this respect, therefore, this is not overwhelmingly a narrative cinema, a cinema of story-telling, but something more akin to that mode of early film-making that Tom Gunning calls the cinema of attractions. In this case, the heritage films display their self-conscious artistry, their landscapes, their properties, their actors and their performance qualities, their clothes, and their often archaic dialogue. The gaze, therefore, is organized around props and settings – the look of the observer at the tableau image – as much as it is around character point of view. The use of flamboyantly designed intertitles in *A Room with a View*, while emphasizing the episodic nature of the narrative, suggests another affinity with very early cinema. It redundantly indicates narrative action before it takes place, and in so doing, interrupts the actual telling of the tale and highlights the artifice of the diegesis. [...] The pictorialist museum aesthetic – the cinema of heritage attractions – provides the ideal showcase for the visual splendour and period richness of the carefully selected interiors and locations.” (Higson 2003 s. 39) Filmene rommer ofte “a series of tableaux of beautifully shot scenes” (Higson 2003 s. 224).

“Many of the films include set-piece celebratory events, lavish dinner parties or balls, for instance, which provide plenty of opportunities for filling the frame with splendid costumes and hair-dos, tableware and food. Equally frequently, conversations take place against a backdrop of picturesque semi-rural southern English scenery, or the frontage of some magnificent castle, stately home, or quaint cottage, the types of ancient architectural and landscape properties conserved by the National Trust and English Heritage. Put the two together, and you have that recurrent image of an imposing country house seen in extreme long shot – sometimes an aerial shot – and set in a verdant landscape of gently rolling hills. [...] Most of the period films in question are organized around a romance plot of one sort or another, and many also include a fair share of narrative coincidence, fateful intervention, and obstacles thrown in the path of love. But if this is the stuff of melodrama, then emotions are underplayed, while sensationalism and contrivance are tastefully obscured – or turned into story events [...] As Dyer and others have suggested, British films will often deal very effectively with emotional repression, the representation of which in itself can be a very moving experience. In

such films, as Dyer puts it, ‘feeling is expressed in what is not said or done, and/or in the suggestiveness of settings, music and situation’.” (Higson 2003 s. 40)

I kulturarvfilmer er det ofte “slow pace and the National Trust-type setting [...] often seen as distinguishing features of the genre. In Coke’s and Weldon’s *PP* [*Pride and Prejudice*-adaptasjonen fra 1980], the English landscape gets lavish scenes of its own (the green, rolling hills of Derbyshire and open fields of Kent); there are long shots of stately exteriors (Netherfield, Rosings, Pemberley); there is a drive through beautiful parklands (Pemberley); there are country walks in Hertfordshire and Kent; there are formally laid out classical gardens (a lavender garden at Longbourn, a topical garden at Pemberley) and informal English cottage gardens (Longbourn); there are peaceful lakes (Pemberley) and impressive, ancient trees (Netherfield, Rosings, the final scenes at Longbourne).” (Sørbø 2008 s. 146) “The pace and mood of the film are also typical of the new heritage genre. The stateliness of exteriors and interiors, the calmness of manners, the distinctness of the diction of the actors, all contributes to the mood, as does the sheer quietness of the family activities.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 147) Marie Nedregotten Sørbø skriver også om 1980-versjonen at “the effect is an atmosphere of slowness, peacefulness, stability” (s. 147). TV-serien skal framstå med et autentisk preg, den har “attempted authenticity” (s. 147). Overklassen består av mennesker uten yrker, som har hele dagen til å pleie sin personlighet.

1980-filmatiseringen av *Pride and Prejudice* har mange historiske detaljer for den som ser etter, delvis gjenstander som får symbolsk betydning: “The prettiness of light curtain fabrics and bowls of pink and yellow flowers, the safety and solidness of Grecian urns, garlanded fireplace-surrounds, mahogany dining tables and high windows set an enchanting mood that contributed greatly to the popularity of the genre.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 147-148) “The impuls of the heritage film to confirm tradition by creating a longing in us for a long-lost world and its life-style is seen mainly in the power of the image: images of old houses in idyllic settings, images of beautiful landscapes and gardens, and not least images of light and harmonious interiors. We have seen that a scene with a potentially ironic conclusion still becomes primarily idyllic due to the impact of the interior: when Charlotte’s and Elizabeth’s disillusioning discussion of failed marriages and the girls’ need to marry in spite of such insights becomes a scene of girlish, smiling confidences in a strikingly beautiful room dominated by pink and yellow flowers on a shiny mahogany table [...]. In such cases, the narrator’s irony of the novel, although still recognizable in certain phrases, is drowned out by the impact of aesthetic beauty on the senses. [...] The film may give us harsh descriptions of marriages, but the world they belong in is visually confirmed as a desirable one.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 148-149) Selv om fiksjonsverdenen ikke alltid er økonomisk og sosialt trygg, kan den kalles “estetisk trygg”. Det er nesten alltid vakre omgivelser, visuell prakt, idylliske settinger.

Hvorfor ble Austen-adaptasjoner fra 1980-tallet av så populære? “The reason is sometimes explained to lie in the assumed period charm of her material. It is an expression of the nostalgic longing for class and tradition, which leads to an aesthetization of ‘a purely white Englishness’ and an aristocratic world (Thompson 2003, 23). [...] Other commentators take the opposite view, that Austen’s popularity must be explained not by escapism into a lost world, but her perceived relevance for the modern world [...] her keen analysis of the vicissitudes of class [...] [dessuten] Austen’s novels provide scenarios addressing contemporary postfeminist concerns” (Sørbø 2008 s. 15-16). Austen-verdenen framstår som “a world of peace and stability and slow time” (Sørbø 2008 s. 175), som en konservativ forankring av “den gode, gamle tiden”. “The servants of Pemberley, Netherfield and Rosings wear eighteenth-century costumes and powdered wigs also in the 1980 and 1995 adaptations, to signify the weight of traditional and historical stability on the grand estates that form the background to the modernness of the young generation.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 178) Filmene taler til en lengsel hos seerne etter en mer harmonisk, forutsigbar, roligere og vakrere tid, der alt gikk i en langsommere rytme. Filmene har altså en nostalgi-effekt. Nostalgien impliserer en oppfatning om at samfunnet var bedre før, at det den gang fantes en slags gylden tidsalder uten vår egen samtids problemer.

Produksjonen av og populariteten til kulturarvfilmene har blitt koblet til Thatcher-konservatismen i Storbritannia på 1980-tallet (Hudelet 2006 s. 96-97). De sosiale omveltningene i Thatcher-perioden skapte et behov for ukritisk nostalgi (Parkinson 2012 s. 203). Den ideologiske koblingen mellom da (f.eks. Austens tid) og nå (det nykonservative Storbritannia) blir gjort i blant annet Andrew Higsons bok *English heritage, English cinema: Costume Drama since 1980* (2003). “[T]he Thatcherite project of reconstruction yoked the modernizing and transformative impulse of enterprise to the concern with tradition and continuity we call heritage. This was not mere rhetoric, and the government gave heritage culture and the heritage industry the official seal of approval in the form of the National Heritage Acts of 1980 and 1983.” (Higson 2003 s. 51). “[T]he growth of the heritage industry took place against a background of perceived national distress and actual economic decline” (Robert Hewison sitert fra Higson 2003 s. 51), mens Raphael Samuel vektla at “the decline of nationality in the present, and the growing uncertainty about its future, have been offset by an enlarged sense of the national past” (sitert fra Higson 2003 s. 52).

“Patrick Wright’s *On Living in an Old Country* and Robert Hewison’s *The Heritage Industry* [...] registered a profound concern from a left-wing point of view about the way in which our relation to the past seemed to have become a part of corporate consumerism, presented in terms of an institutionalized nostalgia. The past, they argued, was increasingly packaged as artefacts and images that could be sold to contemporary consumers, or experiences that could be bought into by tourists. Hewison argued that ‘the growth of the heritage industry took place against a background of perceived national distress and actual economic decline’; it

thus represented a nostalgic and escapist flight from the present: ‘we have turned to the past, both as an economic and a psychological resource’. Britain’s long-term decline as a world economic power coupled with the growth of multinational enterprises, involvement in the pan-national European Union, and the increasing acknowledgement of the multiracial and multicultural nature of British society inevitably disturbed traditional notions of national identity. What are at stake here are the effects of globalization, the blurring of political and economic boundaries, the aggressive global marketing of commodities, traditions, and identities. In this context, the cult of heritage was seen as an attempt to resist the sense of national dissolution by turning to past glories. But the cult was also an industry, and for Hewison, Wright, and others, the exploitation of heritage culture became the defining cultural and economic practice of Britain in the 1980s. [...] ‘heritage’, with its connotations of continuity with the past [...] the government gave heritage culture and the heritage industry the official seal of approval in the form of the National Heritage Acts of 1980 and 1983. These Acts brought into existence the National Heritage Memorial Fund, and an organization to oversee the state’s interests in the past, English Heritage (established in 1984). They also ensured that the number of listed buildings doubled during the Thatcher years. Wright argues that the Acts also reworked concepts of public access and use in terms of commodification, exhibition, and display, encouraging the forthright marketing of the past within a thoroughly market-orientated heritage industry. [...] History, it was argued, was being idealized, sanitized, and rendered harmless and unthreatening; it was being preserved in aspic. It is difficult to deny that a heritage industry developed in the 1980s as a vital part of the contemporary leisure, tourism, and related service industries.” (Higson 2003 s. 51-52)

“Thatcher’s successor, John Major, actually went out of his way to try to renew the heritage effort. Most visibly, a new government ministry, the Department of National Heritage, was established in 1992 to create and maintain the infrastructure necessary to promote a conservative vision of national identity. Two years later, Major announced a ‘crusade’ to ‘rekindle public confidence in Britain’s greatness’, asserting that, despite its entry into Europe, Britain would ‘survive unamendable in all essentials’. [...] For the duration of Major’s Conservative government, however, heritage was to remain very much on the agenda. In 1996, for instance, Virginia Bottomley, the Secretary of State at the Department of National Heritage ‘provoked anger among British film-makers by arguing that they should become part of the heritage industry’. The film industry, she suggested, “should act as a standard-bearer to ‘promote our country, our cultural heritage and our tourist trade ... I am cautious about any edict, but part of my job is to encourage tourism and our great traditions ... This is what films like *Sense and Sensibility* did as well as the BBC’s *Pride and Prejudice*. If we have got the country houses and the landscapes, they should be shown off on film, particularly as we approach the millennium.’ ” ” (Higson 2003 s. 53-54)

“At a Walpole Committee seminar, the sales and marketing director of Jaguar argued that it was now necessary to shift the image of Britishness away from the past: “He seriously believes that period dramas like *Pride & Prejudice*, ... that Mr Darcy and his costume drama cronies, who enchant viewers worldwide, are hindering British industry’s efforts to be viewed as innovative, leading edge producers. ‘We do the past very well in this country, but how can we compete from a high-tech point of view when the rest of the world sees us dressed up in top hats and crinolines all the time?’ ” ” (Higson 2003 s. 55)

“The heritage impulse is thus about seizing hold of selected aspects of the past and presenting them in a way that tallies with current sensibilities and needs – it is, in [David] Lowenthal’s terms, a declaration of faith in a particular way of seeing the past.” (Higson 2003 s. 50) “[T]he UK [...] needs stability, continuity and the memory of great deeds. The heritage film was born in the Thatcher era in a time when it was needed. Heritage films produce a psychological remedy (Rix 44) [...] Proper English manners, values and virtues, tea-times, the right newspapers, etiquette (however horribly French the word may sound in this context), dressing-times, titles, estates and English gardens – the very essence of Englishness [...] indulge in everything upper-class and ostentatious.” (Christa R. Aakær i <https://tidsskrift.dk/lev/article/view/107775/158504>; lesedato 31.03.22)

“Roger Sales [...] sees heritage television as belonging in the context of the Thatcher ‘National Heritage Acts’ of the early 1980s (Sales 1996, 18). Sarah Cardwell times the heritage film as starting with the 1981 *Brideshead Revisited* and culminating with the 1995 BBC *Pride and Prejudice* [...] [disse filmene skulle] educate their viewers: ‘expose the people of Britain to their heritage’ (Brownstein 1998, 15).” (Sørbø 2008 s. 14) National Heritage Acts fra 1983 skulle bidra til bevaring av historisk verdifulle bygninger og monumenter (i vid forstand) i Storbritannia. Kulturarvfilmene vektla seernes “savoring of elegant faces and dresses and furnishings and colours and slants of light; the focus on manners and personal relationships and country houses and greenery; the clarity of speech and importance of dialogue” (Brownstein sitert fra Sørbø 2008 s. 15). Det har fra 1980-tallet foregått en “careful construction of an entire heritage industry around Austen’s name” (Sørbø 2008 s. 45).

“Characteristically marked by tensions, contradictions and ambivalences, the ideology of Thatcherism prevailed in the 1980s when Britain was undergoing an identity crisis. Advocating for individual self-sufficiency, Thatcher introduced a series of economically aggressive policies to establish a free market in Britain, which also meant abolishing the nationalized industries and dismantling governmental controls (see Richards 23-24). Although encouraging economic risk-taking and innovative business practices, Thatcherite individualism fundamentally affected British society with regard to the degeneration of moral values and social problems it generated. [...] For all her aggressive economic policies, Thatcher paradoxically called for a return to ‘Victorian’ moral values, which seemed to be at

odds with the “acquisitive individualism” (Quart 20) implicated in the ideology of Thatcherism. Furthermore, the Thatcher government managed to establish a sense of continuity by focusing on the national ‘heritage’, “one of the most powerful imaginative constructs of our time” (Samuel, qtd. in Higson *Re-presenting* 112), in order to reaffirm the sense of national identity bruised by rapid cultural and social transformations. One of the most conspicuous manifestations of governmental concern with the ‘past’ can be found in the National Heritage Acts of the 1980s and 1983, which institutionalized the very idea of ‘heritage’.” (Yingjie Fu i http://othes.univie.ac.at/10101/1/2010-05-18_0506531.pdf; lesedato 06.11.15)

Thatchers regjering ønsket en tilbakevendig til noen viktorianske verdier (Armelle Parey i <http://lisa.revues.org/2910>; lesedato 09.06.13) “Victorian values were the values when our country became great” sa Margaret Thatcher i et TV-intervju i 1982 (her sitert fra <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/>; lesedato 12.06.13). Primært hadde hun antakelig økonomiske tiltak i tankene: “She called for a return to ‘Victorian values’ – by which she meant rolling back the powers of the state, lowering levels of direct taxation and encouraging people to stand on their own feet.” (professor Eric Evans i <http://www.bbc.co.uk/>; lesedato 12.06.13)

“The Conservative administrations of the 1980s and 1990s had had a vision of the national past which was variously invoked in opposition to European integration, constitutional devolution within the United Kingdom and other issues. Margaret Thatcher had urged the nation to measure itself against the achievements of its Victorian forebears, and her government devoted closer attention to history than to any other subject in the National Curriculum.” (Tosh og Lang 2006 s. xiv)

“A rapidly expanding Heritage industry greeted these visitors from overseas [dvs. turister]. In 1985, Britain could boast of over 2000 museums, with almost half founded since 1971. On average, a new museum opened every two weeks during the 1970s. In 1984/85, two thirds of all foreign tourists visited these museums or historic sites including over 200 country houses owned either privately or by a growing number of national organisations. “No sane person comes to Britain for the weather or the beaches”, the *New York Times* explained in 1988, “They come to see the palaces and the stately homes ... They come for the heritage. That is especially true for Americans and visitors from former outposts of the British empire, whose language, roots and culture owe so much to England”. Thus, history became a profitable commodity in post-imperial Britain. It offered a new class of entrepreneurs an important competitive advantage during the explosive growth of the tourist trade. It also provided a subject of surprising international appeal to financially strapped or politically embattled film-makers, television producers, and their corporate sponsors in Britain and America. At a time when the academic study of history declined precipitously, television helped resuscitate historical drama. A unique convergence of political and economic interests helped revive the Edwardians.” (Dan L. LeMahieu i <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/01439689000260191>; lesedato 17.11.15)

“The reason we’re so fascinated by the adaptation of James, Austen, Forster and the others is that their characters think marriage, fidelity, chastity and honesty are important. In modern movies, characters have no values at all.” (Roger Ebert sitert fra Kaufmann 2007 s. 64). En annen grunn er de gamle, oversiktlige miljøene, og det “rene” ved dem. Den amerikanske regissøren Douglas McGrath, som blant annet regisserte Austen-filmen *Emma* (1996), forklarte på denne måten at det europeiske, historiske stoffet slo an også i USA: “It appeals to urban people – we’re glad when these films open, because life in big American cities is quite harsh. It’s a relief to see a film where the clothes, the houses, the landscapes are pretty and there’s no graffiti.” (sitert fra Kaufmann 2007 s. 307) Folk (de privilegerte) levde “det gode liv”, der “the pace of life is gentle”, altså rolig og kultivert. De var opptatt av “egentlige verdier” som troskap, ærlighet, kyskhets, ekteskap, familie, slekt. Gentlemen og ladies hadde en pålitelig, stabil æreskodeks. Dette fokuset på ære og familieverdier kan oppfattes som et konservativt trekk ved filmene.

På DVD-versjoner av filmene kan det være tilleggs materiale (parafilmer) av typen “The stately homes of *P&P*”, som en hyllest til epoken som filmene viser. På hjemmesiden til Historic Building and Monuments Commission for England (<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/>) var det 9. desember 2009 et par tekster som omtalte Austen, f.eks. denne: “Kirby Hall is one of England’s greatest Elizabethan and 17th-century houses. Begun by Sir Humphrey Stafford, it was purchased by Sir Christopher Hatton, one of Queen Elizabeth’s ‘comely young men’ and later her Lord Chancellor. Hatton hoped in vain to receive the Queen here during one of her annual ‘progresses’ around the country. Although this vast mansion is partly roofless, most of its walls survive to their full impressive height: so does the prodigious three-tier inner porch, begun following French pattern books and later embellished in the Classical style by the sculptor Nicholas Stone. Kirby Hall’s exceptionally rich decoration proclaims that its successive owners were always in the forefront of new ideas about architecture and design. The Great Hall and state rooms remain intact, refitted and redecorated to authentic 17th- and 18th-century specifications. Sir Christopher Hatton the Fourth added the great gardens (described as ‘ye finest garden in England’) in the late 17th century. The gardens and ground floor of the mansion are easily accessible by wheelchair users. An audio tour guides visitors through the house and gardens, accompanied by commentaries from experts in garden history, conservation and country houses. [De følgende filmene har benyttet bygningen under innspillingen:] Jane Austen’s *Mansfield Park* (1999) and *Tristram Shandy: A Cock and Bull Story* (2005).”

Mange av Austen-filmatiseringene viser “the much-loved *bocage* landscape of small hedged fields” (Porteous 1996 s. 193) “French geographers use the word ‘*bocage*’ to mean a landscape where hedgerows are characteristic features. *Bocage* has been used some time in English in the past [...] *Bocage* landscapes are complex with a diversity of functions, which have developed and changed over centuries” (www.researchgate.net/; lesedato 31.03.14).

Den suksessrike 1995-adaptasjonen av *Pride and Prejudice* er en kulturarvfilm, basert på et svært omfattende historisk forarbeid av produsentene. For eksempel gjorde “Dinah Collin, the costume designer, and Caroline Noble, the makeup and hair designer” historiske studier for å gjøre detaljene historisk korrekte. Collin “phoned various museums and worked out a plan of action. It is a very laborious process, gaining access to collections [...]. I visited many excellent collections in Bath, Brighton, Manchester and Worthing. [...] I found some original clothes from this period, but they were often very, very fragile. Until the 1970s we used them extensively; but now these outfits are just too delicate. A lot of them have been put into what are called ‘viewing rooms’, which is useful for research because if you haven’t got that as a basis from which to draw, then you’re lost. Museums often have boxes of things that the curator hasn’t had time to catalogue. Margaret Wicks, for example, who has been in the business for years, has a house just full of clothes. She brought me a little swan’s-down nap and a tippet of exactly the right date. Having taken hundreds of photographs of clothes, it was great to find real things that I could actually use.” (Birtwistle og Conklin 1995 s. 48 og 50)

“Finding a suitable Longbourn was designer Gerry Scott’s biggest concern. ‘I remember saying to Sam that Longbourn was going to be very difficult to achieve. It has to be a very specific size but can’t be too grand; it mustn’t threaten the social levels that we were hoping to establish. It also needed to sit in its own grounds and be from the correct period. We had no idea where we would find such a house, and one’s heart sank at the thought of asking some owner to move out for three months while we shot there! The other problem with these smaller period houses is that a lot of the original features will have been replaced, central heating and fitted carpets put in everywhere and generally a lot of changes done to make them more comfortable for a modern family to live in it. This makes it well-nigh impossible for us to start turning it back into a period location because the costs are just prohibitive.’ ” (Birtwistle og Conklin 1995 s. 22) Eierne av et hus må (mot betaling) tåle f.eks. “the travails of setting a modern film crew loose in an eighteenth-century house filled with priceless antiques.” (Yaffe 2013 s. 40)

Parafilmen i begynnelsen i hver episode av *Pride and Prejudice*-adaptasjonen fra 1995, en TV-serie produsert av BBC, viser kvinnelig håndarbeid; “as a mood-setter for the heritage-film, focusing on the beauty of the tradition, and the world that is gone” (Sørbø 2008 s. 174). “For women of the “genteel” classes the goal of non-domestic education was thus often the acquisition of “accomplishments”, such as the ability to draw, sing, play music, or speak modern (i.e. non-Classical) languages (generally French and Italian). Though it was not usually stated with such open cynicism, the purpose of such accomplishments was often only to attract a husband; so that these skills then tended to be neglected after marriage” (<http://www.pemberley.com/janeinfo/pptopic2.html#accomplishrev>; lesedato 14.08.15). Håndarbeidet i parafilmen representerer en kvinnelig “accomplishment” som krevde enorme mengder tid og flid. Filmene viser på mange måter fram fenomenet

langsomhet. Menneskene har generelt rikelig av tid (selv om de noen ganger er i tidsnød, f.eks. for å finne seg en passelig ektefelle). Og håndarbeid som forbereder livets store begivenheter – som bryllup og barnedåp – kan foregå over mange år.

Pride and Prejudice-adaptasjonen fra 1995 har en symbolsk, kjønnsrelatert innledningsdel i første episode: “juxtaposition of the race of men versus the walk of the woman, the men running horses versus the woman skipping tentatively on her own two legs, of male power and female peace, of the male wide world and the female small family, even of the galloping horse and the grazing mare” (Sørbø 2008 s. 171). I denne TV-serien Elizabeth “sometimes wears a jacket in honey-coloured velvet, with a russet bonnet and brown ribbons, perhaps suggesting her warmth and down-to-earth-like personality.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 152) Hun går og småløper alene ute i naturen. Elizabeth i romanen leser Darcys brev om Wickham gående på en vei; i to andre filmatiseringer leser hun derimot brevet i en vakker park. Vei-versjonen “would not have made any tourist agency happy if rendered on film” (Sørbø 2008 s. 154). Stedene er ikke lagd av kulisser, men finnes reelt, og filmenes popularitet fremmer reise-iver og turisme.

Pride and Prejudice fra 1995 “coincided with new technology that made films more accessible; during the nineties it gradually became common for people to own a video-machine, which meant that they could review favourite films as often as they wanted to. For the first time, we hear of film audiences that uses the rewind-button to review favourite scenes over and over again. And the scenes that viewers were most fascinated by were those added by the filmmakers to fill in Austen’s ‘gaps’ (the Darcy scenes [...]).” (Sørbø 2008 s. 150) 1995-adaptasjonen har “at least fourteen new situations evidently added for the purpose of giving Darcy’s perspective. They are: a surprise meeting between Darcy and Elizabeth in the Netherfield garden; Elizabeth coming across Darcy in the Netherfield billiard-room; Darcy taking a bath and discovering Elizabeth playing with a dog outside his window; Darcy looking after the departing carriage as Elizabeth leaves Netherfield; Darcy walking back to Rosings after having been refused by Elizabeth; writing his letter of explanation through the night; taking fencing lessons; taking a swim in a lake at Pemberley; walking in a wet shirt towards his house; hosting a dinner party and then walking through his dark house afterwards, thinking of Elizabeth; getting dressed in his bedroom and then riding out; demonstrating annoyance with miss Bingley and preoccupation (evidently with Elizabeth) in a Pemberley evening scene; travelling to London; and lastly hunting through London’s back streets for Lydia, appearing at her wedding, and negotiating with the Gardiners.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 163) “One of the flashbacks during the letter-writing scene also shows us Darcy as a child, playing with Wickham, and this is certainly something we have never seen before either in novel or films, and one of many factors that add up to make him human and sympathetic.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 164)

De tilføyde Darcy-scenene i 1995-serien skal “reveal him as a physically active and sensitive individual” (Sue Parrill sitert fra Kaufmann 2007 s. 309). “The spectacle

of Colin Firth in a shirt open at the throat, a look of frustrated passion on his face, may have been responsible for the Darcymania that swept over England after *Pride and Prejudice* appeared on the BBC.” (Sue Parrill sitert fra Kaufmann 2007 s. 310) Elizabeth på sin side strutter av livsglede, klokhet og slagferdighet, blandet med vennlighet og omtenkksomhet (Kaufmann 2007 s. 309). Hun liker å bevege seg utendørs, og hennes friske hudfarge blir kritisert av Miss Bingley. For en mann som jakter, fekter, rir og svømmer, er en slik kvinnelig partner ideell (s. 309).

I Darcys stumme blikk kan seerne ane hans indre strid med sine følelser. Følelsene hans “vet mer enn hans forstand” (Kaufmann 2007 s. 309). Hele 1995-versjonen er preget av “blikkdramaturgi” (Kaufmann 2007 s. 310). “The filmmakers have certainly made the most of Darcy’s stares, which are also often remarked upon in the novel.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 166) Han er motvillig tiltrukket av Elizabeth. Hun på sin side blir stadig mer forsonet med hans “stolthet”, særlig etter å ha sett Pemberley. Det er små signaler om at begge følelser intensiveres: “He is helping her into the carriage, and therefore by necessity touches her gloved hand, but the close-up of the two hands is the film’s way of reminding us of the emotional intensity of seemingly ordinary incidents. [...] it is an expression of a turn of the millennium fascination for the erotic possibilities of a more inhibited time. [...] Paradoxically, the intimacy is not less because of this restraint, but greater, since there is a wider repertoire of intimacies when even the first time use of each other’s Christian names is thrilling.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 167-168) Etter svømmingen i innsjøen kler Darcy seg om, mens Elizabeth fortsatt er ute i parken rundt Pemberley. “[T]he montage effect of combining the two parallel actions is done in such a way as to achieve an erotic suggestiveness. Elizabeth here (in the viewer’s eyes) comes very close to admiring Darcy undressing.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 165) Produsenten Sue Birtwhistle hadde som et av målene med adaptasjonen å vise at *Pride and Prejudice* er “simply the sexiest book ever written” (Birtwhistle og Conklin 1995 s. vi; Sørbø 2008 s. 169). “No doubt, we made a mistake when we described the novel as sexy; what we meant, of course, was that Darcy staring at Elizabeth across a room is exciting, that Darcy and Elizabeth touching hands the first time they dance is erotic. What we did not mean was naked bedroom scenes.” (Birtwhistle og Conklin 1995 s. vi)

“[T]he absence of mainstream eroticism in favour of a more subtle expression of sexuality [...] invites a mode of ‘genteel’ spectatorship ‘superior’ to that demanded by mainstream film narratives. The over-investment in “the look”, in gestures, fleeting glances, failed speech, clamped emotions and frustrated intentions [...] make for a mode of address that dwells on the pleasurable performance of repression, and presents a distinctive alternative to mainstream commercial genres [...] performance of emotional restraint” (Vidal 2012 s. 26-27).

Når Darcy og Elizabeth danser sammen på Netherfield-ballet, krever dansen at de tar hverandre i hendene og så slipper hendene, nærmer seg hverandre, går fra hverandre, snur ryggen til hverandre osv. “It is a perfect, proleptic [dvs. som

forvarsel] parallel to the pattern of their whole relationship, which will turn out to be full of contradictions; attraction alternating with rejection.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 168) Deres dans markerer dessuten en tydelig kontrast mellom harmoniske bevegelser og en uharmonisk samtale i løpet av dansen.

Etter at Elizabeth har sagt ja til å gifte seg med Darcy, er hun i fortrolig samtale med Jane: “[T]here is the remarkable use of visual symbolism in the last of the ‘confidante scenes’. We see Elizabeth before her bedroom mirrors telling the news of her engagement to a disbelieving Jane. The scene is beautifully done, with three images of Elizabeth (two mirrored faces and one neck seen from behind, which, as she turns, becomes two mirrored necks and one face) surrounding one reflection of Jane, as if symbolizing the confusion that results from her announcement. Neither Jane nor her father understands her, so they try to figure out her motives for accepting Mr Darcy. Who is Elizabeth, the one to the right, the one to the left, or the one in the middle? Is she mercenary, or overly kind in response to his generosity to her family, or does she really care for him?” (Sørbø 2008 s. 170)

1995-serien “balances between romantic comedy and comedy of manners in a way that reminds us of Austen’s balancing of the demands of her courtship plot and her ironic voice. But unlike her, it comes down on the side of romance, and surrenders the irony to this ulterior goal. Austen does the opposite in *PP*; she sacrifices the demands of romance to state her ironic points. To keep her ironic perspective, she avoids entering into love scenes. And she sacrifices the standard happy ending [det er ingen bryllupsscene på slutten hos henne] for her preferred statement of human complexity. This is evidently seen as a weakness that is attempted amended in the film. Here, the illusion of perfection replaces the reminder of imperfections.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 177)

Pride & Prejudice (2005; regissert av engelske Joe Wright) viser Lizzy og Darcy ute i et naturlandskap som blir til et slags sjelelandskap, et symbol for noe ufattelig og metafysisk (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 411-412). Dette landskapet står i sterk kontrast til det bondske ved søstrene Bennets hjem i den samme filmen. I denne adaptasjonen “class distinctions are deliberately exaggerated to strengthen the Cinderella theme” (Sørbø 2008 s. 190). Elizabeths hjem er omgitt av husdyr. Da Elizabeth har nektet å gifte seg med Mr Collins, løper moren etter henne og skremmer opp en flokk gjess (og moren ligner en kaklende gås). Vi får også se bakgården med høner, en gris som mates osv. Ingen andre adaptasjoner har vist Bennet-familien som såpass fattig. Men familien framtrer som lykkeligere enn i tidligere adaptasjoner. Herr og fru Bennet lever relativt godt sammen.

“Deep England as an icon arose during the Second World War as a unifying concept of everything English. This icon has, however, long historical roots, and its significance is not only patriotic, but it is also a reaction to modernity. The icon is materialized in a fictitious southern, rural and pastoral England with close-knit communities centred on the village green. [...] Rural life, the country or the

countryside have found their concentrated and iconic expression in the concept of Deep England, which was coined by Angus Calder in *The Myth of the Blitz* (1991). [...] The Constable-like shots of farm life [dvs. ligner maleren John Constables bilder] with pastoral harmony between animals, people, the land, the seasons and the slow tempo of country life culminate in a picnic scene, in which the womenfolk carry pitchers with home-brewed beer and refreshments to the harvesters' lunch-break [...] this static and traditional farm life of Deep England. [...] some interior essence of Britain [...] Deep England is an alternative to modernity [...] Deep England with its inclusive and unifying function has inherent power to be iconic of a whole nation's self-image. [...] what Augé calls anthropological places. These places and architecture embody especially local history, social memory and communal identity.” (Jørgen Riber Christensen i http://www.akademiskkvarter.hum.aau.dk/pdf/vol10/1_JoergenRiberChristensen_Deep-England.pdf; lesedato 24.02.20) Angus Calder hevder at “a vision of England as a pastoral, classless country with thatched roofs and small villages is what was created to try and pull the English together” under 2. verdenskrig (<http://resolutereader.blogspot.com/2005/08/angus-calder-myth-of-blitz.html>; lesedato 24.02.20).

Et eksempel på en framstilling av “Deep England” er serien *Cranford* (2007), basert på romaner av Elizabeth Gaskell. Landsbykvinnene som er hovedpersonene blir dypt bekymret når de får høre at det skal legges togskiner til Cranford. For dem representerer jernbanen alt som er moderne og forstyrrende for deres fredelige eksistens og deres tradisjoner. De ønsker ingen forandringer, og frykter at deres rolige, trygge tilværelse vil forsvinne når den moderne tid ankommer med det første toget.

Julian Fellowes m.fl.s TV-serie *Downton Abbey* (2010-2015) er både en såpe-lignende serie og en kulturarvfilmserie, med handling fra perioden 1912-25. Den gir et innblikk i livet til godseiere og deres tjenere i et aristokratisk miljø i England. Serien ble spilt inn på godset Highclere Castle i Hampshire med store ressurser for å få de historiske detaljene mest mulig korrekte. Serien får sin spenning primært fra forholdet mellom herskap og tjenere, “upstairs” og “downstairs”, og spinner ut en lang rekke relativt usannsynlige intriger (derfor minner serien om en såpeserie). Å holde fasaden er viktig i overklassemiljøet, å finne passende ekteskapspartnere osv., og slike faktorer vises fra individuelt perspektiv i serien. Den har ikke den typiske langsomheten fra kulturarvfilmer, men er nøye med de historiske detaljene (selv om tjenerfløyen og kjøkkenet er gjenskapt i et filmstudio).

I *Downton Abbey* er Highclere Castle “really shown as it is, apart from a few pieces of furniture, it's extremely sensitive and has to be taken care of in an unusual way. Things take longer than they might in another location because there are areas you can't put lights near, or certain pieces of furniture that can't be touched or moved. You really have to respect what it is, and I think that adds to the authenticity. Things haven't been glamorized. The wall covering in the entryway is an embossed painted leather from the 17th century and it's quite tattered in places; you wouldn't

build a set like that. But when you live in a house like that for centuries, certain elements just age and aren't thought of as décor that needs to be maintained or changed." (regissøren Michael Engler i <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/08/arts/television/downton-abbey-edith-bertie-dinner-director-interview.html>; lesedato 17.09.18)

"Not only has screenwriter Julian Fellowes given us a brilliant script, the costumes and film locations are stunning. Please welcome guest blogger Abby Stambach, whose lovely blog Nooks, Towers and Turrets features information and commentary on historic homes and stately architectural highlights. She has graciously offered a tour of film locations used in Downton Abbey. [...] The Crawley estate was brought to life at Highclere Castle in the county of Hampshire. It sits on 1,000 acres of parkland and it has been the country seat of the Earls of Carnarvon since 1679. During the late 18th and early 19th centuries, Henry Herbert, the 1st Earl of Carnarvon made many improvements to the building transforming it to a Georgian mansion. [...] The grounds and several rooms of Highclere Castle are featured throughout Downton Abbey. The salon, library, dining room and entrance hall are seen frequently. The scenes taking place in the servants' living quarters were not filmed at Highclere but rather at Ealing Studios. It was necessary to build the servants quarters from scratch because the quarters used by servants in the early 20th-century are either gone, or greatly changed. The production crew took great care in making the transitions from the rooms of Highclere to the servants' quarters look real." (<http://austenprose.com/2011/01/28/downton-abbey-stunning-film-locations/>; lesedato 29.09.11)

"The scenes taking place in Downton village were filmed in the town of Bampton in the county of Oxfordshire. Bampton was chosen because it "provided an authentic backdrop close to London." Producer Nigel Marchant also said that "Bampton is perfect because it is so well preserved, and you hardly need to do anything in terms of alterations." [...] Several buildings in Bampton were used for filming. Lord Grantham patrons the hospital in Downton and the series has many scenes taking place in the hospital. The exterior of the Bampton Library became the entrance of the hospital and the interior scenes were filmed elsewhere. [...] In episode two, we see Matthew Crawley and Lady Edith tour a local church. These scenes were filmed at St. Mary's Church in Bampton. This church was a part of an ancient parish within an Anglo-Saxon royal estate and there is archeological evidence that suggests a church was on the site before the Norman Conquest. However, the earliest surviving document records the gift of the church to Leofric, Bishop of Exeter and the Church of Peter by William the Conqueror. It is likely that the original church was destroyed by fire in 1142 and the present day building was built beginning in 1153. The church was remodeled in 1270 when the spire and aisles were added." (Abby Stambach i <http://austenprose.com/2011/01/28/downton-abbey-stunning-film-locations/>; lesedato 29.09.11)

Sir Robert, jarlen av Grantham i *Downton Abbey*, spilt av Hugh Bonneville i serien, uttalte i et intervju: “I dag uttrykker vi så mye av det vi føler, så lett og så hyppig. Det er noe fint ved å gå tilbake til det uuttalte.” (*Dagbladet Magasinet* 29. september 2012 s. 61) En medieforsker har skrevet om serien: “Menneskene, interiørene, de utsøkte manerene. 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.” (Hege Gundersen i *Dagbladet Magasinet* 29. september 2012 s. 61 om *Downton Abbey*)

“The real counterpart to the life of the Crawley family is found in the life of Lady Almina who married the 5th Earl of Carnarvon in 1895 and became Lady Almina Herbert of Highclere Castle – the real Downton Abbey. To give a brief illustration of how history has been down-scaled, a comparative analysis of Lady Mary Crawley’s wedding in 1920 and Lady Almina Herbert’s wedding reveals a handful of the differences. First, the scope of Mary’s wedding is nothing compared to that of Almina’s. Mary is married in the small local church of the Downton village, while Almina is married in St. Margaret’s Church on Parliament Square in London, which, for the occasion, was filled to the brim with flower decorations and palm trees. Just to top it off, the former Prime Minister was present at Almina’s wedding. Moreover, regular celebrations at Highclere Castle around the 1900s included around 500 guests and on occasion members of the royal family (Carnarvon 1-15) (S3E1 01:03:48). Of course, it must be considered that a world war happened in between the two weddings, and that the plot of the series is not based on the life of the Carnarvon family. However, there is a strangeness to the fact that the Crawley characters are put into the real house and home of the Carnarvon family with their authentic furniture and their ancestors on the walls, while all their pomp and circumstance are minimized to such a degree that the audience is served a completely different story about what reality looked like for noble families in England around 1900. Consequently, historical circumstances to which a present-day audience might not be able to relate are substituted with fictional narration in which the audience can engage and successfully bond with their own past.” (Christa R. Aakær i <https://tidsskrift.dk/lev/article/view/107775/158504>; lesedato 31.03.22)

“Why do Americans love *Downton Abbey* so much? [...] The drama, which debuted in the US in 2011, was the highest rated cable or broadcast show when its third series finale aired in February this year, reaching 12.3 million viewers and becoming the most popular drama in the history of the Public Broadcasting Service. [...] Michelle Obama is such a fan that last autumn she requested advance DVDs of the third series from ITV and invited two of the show’s stars, Hugh Bonneville and Elizabeth McGovern, to the White House. [...] Doesn’t the show, commentators ask with furrowed brow, fetishise and fawn over an outdated and unjust class system? Isn’t it troubling that the American public, despite its much-touted

embrace of equality and meritocracy, gobbles up this “steaming, silvered tureen of snobbery”, to quote the British-born historian Simon Schama, in a desperate search for “something, anything, to take its mind off the perplexities of the present”? Schama can’t abide *Downton Abbey*, he wrote on the Daily Beast, having been subjected in his youth to “the motheaten haughtiness of the toffs” at a country house much like the titular abbey. [...] *Downton Abbey* as a dramatic setting has the advantage of being both a household and a workplace, two sites that have always proven fertile ground for conflict and pathos. [...] It’s not that Americans don’t grasp the injustice in the social hierarchy of Edwardian Britain; they just don’t take it seriously.” (Laura Miller i <http://www.newstatesman.com/tv-and-radio/2013/09/why-do-americans-love-downton-abbey-so-much>; lesedato 24.10.13)

“Camden County College in New Jersey has announced a five-session course about the show, “*Downton Abbey: Life in a Country House*,” that tackles such topics as “The Inheritance Problem: Marriage, Women and Property,” “Servants and Solicitors,” and “Technology Intrudes: Lights, Phones and Cars.” Surprisingly, this is not the first *Downton Abbey*-centric course on the market. Earlier this month, the Detroit Free Press reported on Oakland University’s “The World of *Downton Abbey: Revolution, Rebellion and Re-Creation*.” Students enrolled in the class meet in the garage of Meadow Brook Hall, a country-style home built by automotive pioneer John F. Dodge’s ex-wife Matilda Dodge Wilson in 1928 (which is fitting for the 20s-set series) in Rochester Hills, Michigan, and snack on teas and scones. Professor Randall Engle explained that he pitched the course to the college’s honors program after “watching the show with my wife and just [getting] hooked on English history.” ” (<http://www.vanityfair.com/online/oscars/2013/10/downton-abbey-college-class0>; lesedato 24.10.13)

“Proper English manners, values and virtues, tea-times, the right newspapers, etiquette (however horribly French the word may sound in this context), dressing-times, titles, estates and English gardens – the very essence of Englishness – permeate every second of the series [*Downton Abbey*], because the England of then is not the England of today. [...] ‘a poeticised past that never was’ in the words of Robert W. Rix” (Christa Rydeberg Aakær i <https://tidsskrift.dk/lev/article/view/107775/158504>; lesedato 18.06.20).

“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)

Den britiske forfatteren Antonia Susan Byatts roman *The Children’s Book* (2009) beskriver svært mange historiske detaljer, og anmelderen Espen Grønlie skrev

derfor: “Tidlig i lesningen tenkte jeg – som alle skribenter tenker jeg i anførselstegn – “denne boken formelig ber om å bli filmatisert i kjent historisk-autentisk BBCstil”. Men så slo det meg at det i så fall ikke akkurat er noen strategisk bønn, for hvem i all verden ønsker å filmatisere en beretning så proppfull av detaljer? Det blir jo ingen frihet igjen for regissøren! En regissør vil være bastet og bundet hvis målet er å være tro mot Byatts bok. De fabelaktige BBCseriene basert på Jane Austens romaner har litterære forelegg som langt på vei tar byggeskikk, interiør og antrekk for gitt, og de historiekyndige konsulentene kan utvungent kle opp skuespillerne og plassere dem i landadelens romslige boliger.” (*Morgenbladet* 29. april–5. mai 2011 s. 34)

“One of its commonest expressions [av nostalgi] in Britain today is ‘heritage’. When the past is conserved or re-enacted for our entertainment, it is usually (though not invariably) presented in its most attractive light. Bygone splendours, such as the medieval tournament or the Elizabethan banquet, naturally lend themselves to the pleasures of spectacle; but everyday life – such as the back-breaking routines of the early industrial craft shop or the Victorian kitchen – is also dressed up in order to be visually appealing. A sense of loss is part of the experience of visiting heritage sites.” (Tosh og Lang 2006 s. 17)

Patrick Wrights bok *On Living in an Old Country: The National Past in Contemporary Britain* (1985, oppdatert utgave 2009) “captures the ways in which history lives on as a tangible presence, permeating everyday life and shaping our sense of identity [and] Investigates the rise of ‘heritage’ across contemporary Britain, in literature, advertising, political rhetoric, television, conservation campaigns, and even urban development” (<http://ukcatalogue.oup.com/>; lesedato 03.01.14).

Den danske TV-serien *Matador* (1978-81) er regissert av Erik Balling og basert på ideer av den danske journalisten og forfatteren Lise Nørgaard, som var en av manuskript-forfatterne. Handlingen foregår i perioden 1929-47 i en liten dansk by. Nørgaard har skrevet det følgende om serien:

“Mens vi lavede Matador, var vi klar over, at der overalt i landet ville sidde opmærksomme seere og lure på, om vi dummede os med hensyn til miljø, boligvaner, butiks-indretning og kostumer. Enhver gammel herre- eller dameskrædder med respekt for sig selv ville have øjnene stift hæftet på revers, bukseopslag og buksevidder, skulderbredder, slipse- og flipfaconer, taljemarkering og skørtelængde. Ligesom ældre møbelhandlere, isenkræmmere og legetøjshandlere og mange andre ville kontrollere, om de ting, og det bohavede, der forekom i serien, var i den tids stil i forhold til de mennesker, der anvendte disse sager. Af samme årsag lod vi os gribe af perfektionisme. Vi ville nødtigt tages i en eller anden fejl. En af grundene til, at vi klarede skærene og også kunne hæfte de rigtige priser på varerne, når de blev forhandlet – for eksempel fra Mads Skjerns butik – var et intens studie af annoncer i avisårgange fra Matador-årene. Dertil kom de finere modejournaler

fra Paris, de almindelige sy-selv journaler til de danske forbrugere i årene mellem 1929 og 1947. Og endelig, og ikke mindst, var der varekatalogerne, der tydeligt viste, hvad almindelige danskere i den periode brugte til husførelsen og boligindretningen og hvad deres børn legede med.” (Lise Nørgaard i Hernes 1990 s. 57)

“Journalerne, der beskrev den højere franske mode, havde først og fremmest interesse for tøjfabrikanter og forretningsindehavere som for eksempel Mads Skjern, fordi de af de parisiske forslag kunne se, hvorhen det bar, og indrette deres produktion og indkøb derefter. Desuden blev de franske modehæfter studeret af de få overklassedamer, der gerne ville være med på det nyeste nye. I vores tilfælde Maude Varnæs, der blandt andet karakteriseres ved at hun gerne vil være byens mest velklædte dame. Hun har sans for tøj og det er ikke tilfældigt, at hun senere er den første, der ser Daniel Skjerns muligheder som modekunstner. Byens andre damer af det bedre selskab, incl. Ingeborg Skjern, går mere ind for det, der hedder solid elegance. Det vil sige mere tidløst tøj af god og holdbar kvalitet. Typisk for sådanne damer var, at de med mellemrum fik skræddersyet en dragt – ofte hos deres mands skrædder – og den holdt så sin tid ud. Blandt de breve, jeg modtog efter fremførelsen af de første tolv afsnit af Matador, var der et par stykker om Elisabeth Friis’ uopslidelige dragt. Yngre seere spurgte, om det virkelig kunne tænkes, at hun brugte den samme dragt 5-6 år i træk. De ældre spurgte ikke. De vidste bedre. For det var princippet dengang, at det gode og relativt dyre tøj blev brugt til det var slidt. Det gjaldt forøvrigt også for det billigere tøj, som blev anvendt i andre kredse af befolkningen. Slidstærkt var et ord, der gik igen i annoncerne for alle former for beklædning. Det med at smide tøjet ud og købe nyt fra år til år blev ikke brugt i de tider, hvadenten man var rig eller fattig. At købe og så kassere var først en dille, der greb os, da vi var vel over anden verdenskrig og fanget af den tiltagende forbrugerisme. Dengang – i Matador-årene – forandrede moden sig ikke så hurtigt som nu, og udskiftede folk endelig deres bedre tøj for at få noget nyt, kom det kasserede tøj til nytte på andre måder, medmindre det ligefrem var slidt i laser. Det blev syet om til egne børn, også i de bedre kredse, eller skænket bort til tjenestefolk eller arbejderkoner, man var i berøring med i det daglige. Det hændte også, at damekredse sad og syede deres aflagte tøj om til veldædighed overfor de dårligst stilledes børn, der ellers ikke ville få ordentligt tøj på kroppen. Mange arbejdere gik i tredivekrisisens år udelukkende i skænket eller arvet tøj og det samme gjaldt delvis tjenestefolkene, der ofte sled videre på fruens kreationer. Det er ikke tilfældigt, at stuepigen Agnes står brud i en af sin frues parisermodeller. Det kan man opnå, når man har tjent i et ordentligt hus, siger Laura til den nye stuepige, der skal efterfølge Agnes.” (Lise Nørgaard i Hernes 1990 s. 57-58)

“Allerede mens de første seks afsnit af Matador blev vist, fik vi – med henblik på produktionen af de næste seks – tilbud fra venlige mennesker, som lå inde med gammelt husgeråd, kontor- og butiksinventar, gamle regne- og skrivemaskiner og meget andet godt fra tiden. Der kom også forbløffende mange henvendelser fra ældre damer, der gerne ville sælge os de parisermodeller, de havde haft hængende i

næsten halvtreds år. De mente, at vi ved hjælp af dette tøj kunne klæde et betragteligt antal af seriens hovedpersoner i tidens stil. Men deri tog de fejl. En pariser-model forbliver et kunstværk, der sladrer om sin pris på lang afstand, hvor gammel den end er blevet. Så det var udelukkende tøj, der kunne hænges på Maude Varnæs og senere måske på Ellen Skjern, der også tillægger sig flotte påklædningsvaner, efter allersidste mode. De andre måtte betrækkes med kjoler og dragter, inspireret af sy-journaler, gamle skræddermønstre og ikke mindst katalogerne, primært Daells Varehus' katalog. For heri kunne seriens uforlignelige kostumechef, Ulla-Britt Søderlund, finde alle svar på, hvad almindelige mennesker begærede og hvor langt de forskellige typer indenfor diverse samfundsgrupper var kommet i deres forhold til moden. For selv nu er det jo sådan, at nogle mennesker er mere modebevidste end andre. Man kan faktisk karakterisere folk gennem det, de har på: nogle springer omgående på de nyeste forslag, mens andre tøver og faktisk først hopper på en mode, når den er på vej ud igen. Vis mig, hvad du har på, og jeg skal sige dig, hvem du er: dristig og fremadrettet eller forsigtig og konservativ. Eller måske bare stædig som gamle Fru Møhge, der klynger sig til sin grå atlaskes og hænger sit gamle tøj på datteren Misse.” (Lise Nørgaard i Hernes 1990 s. 58 og 60)

“Daells Varehus' kataloger var også en gave til revisitorerne, der kunne se, hvordan brugsgenstande, fra husgeråd, bohøve og linned til børnenes legetøj, så ud i hine tider. For mig var katalogerne fascinerende læsning, der bidrog til rejsen tilbage i fortiden, dengang vore indkøbsvaner, ligesom vore penges værdi, var ganske anderledes end nu. I Roskilde, hvor jeg voksede op, forefandt jeg allerede dengang adskillige butikker med møbler, isenkram og manufaktur. Nogle af de sidste mindede om Arnesens “Damernes Magasin” og andre om Mads Skjerns nye butik, der henvendte sig til så mange som muligt og bevidst konkurrerede på prisen, ikke bare med Albert Arnesen, så længe han varede, men også med katalogernes tilbud. Matador handler ikke om nogen butik i min barndoms by, men jeg har naturligvis hentet inspirerende detaljer fra de år, da jeg som barn gik på indkøb med min mor eller moster. Med udslåede ører og med øjnene på stilke registrerede jeg tidligt den forunderlige hakkeorden, når ekspeditricen eller ekspedienten i en af byens såkaldt finere butikker slap den beskedent udseende kunde, han eller hun var i gang med, for at styre hen til byens mere etablerede damer, hvis de sejlede ind i forretningen. Det undrede mig, at den oversete kunde fandt sig i en så uforskammet forskelsbehandling, og at en forretning kunne klare sig ved at demonstrere en så dårlig opførsel. Retfærdigvis skal det siges, at min mor altid elskværdigt afviste denne fortrinsret og den blev heller ikke praktiseret i den hattesalon, hun havde etableret i sin tidlige ungdom og beholdt nogle år ind i ægteskabet med min far.” (Lise Nørgaard i Hernes 1990 s. 60)

De italienske filmene *Cinema Paradiso* (1988; regissert av Giuseppe Tornatore) og *Postmannen* (1994; regissert av Michael Radford og Massimo Troisi) “achieved wide circulation as Italian heritage films in the early 1990s.” (Vidal 2012 s. 54)

Betegnelsen “post-heritage” “carries the implication that previous examples of the heritage film were incapable of radicalism in intention or interpretation. [...] Some examples, such as *The Revengers Tragedy* and *A Cock and Bull Story*, could even be identified as ‘anti-heritage’ in their self-conscious subversion and parody of the expectations of a period film.” (Leggott 2008 s. 82)

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

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