

Andrzej Weseliński

Akademia Finansów i Biznesu Vistula – Warszawa

BRITISH HERITAGE FILMS IN THE 1980S AND 1990S

Summary

The paper explores British heritage films produced over the last two decades of the 20th century in the context of profound cultural and social changes. The international success of heritage films sparked off lively debates about what the term „heritage” stands for. The first part of the paper provides a brief account of the fundamental issues and concepts of the British heritage cinema. The latter part traces the growth and development of the „quality” heritage film which in the 1990s evolved into a marketable commodity that can be sold to international audiences.

Key words: heritage film, costume drama, heritage culture, literary adaptations, *Orlando*, *Carington*, *Shakespeare in Love*.

The emergence of lavishly produced „quality” films, variously called costume dramas and heritage films, made in Britain and France in the last decades of the twentieth century has attracted much critical attention. Those films were usually based on „popular classics” (Jane Austen, E.M. Forster, Shakespeare, Hugo, Zola), although original scripts based broadly on historical facts can also be found in the mix. The best known of the early heritage films are productions by the Merchant Ivory team, that is, director James Ivory, producer Ismail Merchant, and screenwriter Ruth Praver Jhabvala, which include three adaptations of E. M. Forster’s novels: *A Room with a View* (1985), *Maurice* (1987), and *Howards End* (1992), but many film scholars claim that Hugh Hudson’s *Chariots of Fire* (1981) set this profitable new trend in British and European cinema. For instance, Susan Hayward in her book *Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts* writes that Hudson’s film initiated heritage cinema which promotes „an idealistic image of the past, and in many instances reinforces bourgeois sentimentality (...) Within the narratives, issues such as gender relations, class and sexualities come to the fore; critiques of ideological positionings can be uncovered” (Hayward 2013, p. 93). Hayward argues that heritage cinema and costume dramas, in common with historical films, have a similar ideological function. While historical films are serving up the country’s national history before the eyes of the indigenous people, teaching them history according to the „great moments” and „great men or women” in the glorious past, costume dramas and heritage cinema, when serving up literary adaptations, feed film audiences the „classics” of the nation’s culture. And the critic notes that costume dramas and heritage films are popular with audiences as much because of the attention to detail as because of the enjoyment of the actual narrative.

In a similar fashion, in his book *English Heritage, English Cinema: Costume Drama since 1980*, Andrew Higson maintains that English costume dramas produced in the last decades of the twentieth century show a tendency to articulate „a nostalgic and conservative celebration of the values and lifestyles of the privileged classes”, that is, the white, Anglo-Saxon community in a semi-rural Southern England. Higson stresses that the heritage film label is a critical invention of recent years which emerged in a particular cultural context to serve a specific purpose. While launching a romanticised version of a minor section of the British population, heritage/costume films avoid addressing the social and racial diversity of a changing Britain. In doing so, those films reinvent „an England that no longer existed (...) as something fondly remembered and desirable” (Higson 2003, p. 12).

The enormous success of British heritage/costume films has provoked lively debates about the conservatism of the genre and about what the term „heritage” stands for. It should be noted that costume films and period films have been made since the silent movie era. All these terms, that is, costume drama, period film, and heritage film, often address an overlapping corpus of films and converge in the idea of a pastness which is divulged by costume, signalled by „period” quality, and implied in the canonical literary text. Susan Hayward observes that film production values tend to match the perceived value of the source text. While popular fiction adaptations have relatively low production values, modern adaptations of classic novels have national value in that they mirror a desire to be identified with the values of traditional culture and taste to which social elites and generations aspire. Since audience expectations are high, filmmakers are aiming for an authentic re-creation of the past in „quality” heritage films through appropriate setting, quality *mise-en-scène*, minute attention to *décor* and costume as well as for star vehicles to embody the main roles. Hayward emphasizes that authenticity is the key term where heritage cinema is concerned, at least in terms of the production practices: „From setting, costumes, objects to use of colour (...) every detail must appear authentic. Hence the very high costs of producing such films” (Hayward 2013, p. 93). It is no secret that „quality” heritage films are shot with high budgets by prestige producers and top directors, and that they use film stars, many changes of *décor* and extras, well-researched interior designs, advanced camera technology, polished lighting as well as classical or classical-inspired music.

The heritage film label, which has gained wide currency since the late 1980s, may be understood in various ways. The concept of „heritage film” and its Austro-German equivalent *Heimatfilm*, which had its heyday in the 1950s, is a subject in itself. In his perceptive essay, Eckart Voigts-Virchow points out that *Heimat* and „heritage” are roughly parallel terms which have slightly different shades of meaning. The English heritage concept appears more elitist, feminine, regional, and historical than the German *Heimat* (home, town, native country), which is more ethnic, masculine, national, and spatial, and which has been tainted by its use in fascist and Nazi ideologies. Contemporary heritage-film audiences, Voigts-Virchow

argues, „seem to respond better to the modest scope of the English heritage construction – domestic, regional, feminine, elitist” (Voigts-Virchow 2010, p. 126).

It is worth mentioning that Charles Barr is credited with introducing the term „heritage film” in the late 1980s. In his Introduction to the collection of film criticism *All Our Yesterdays: 90 Years of British Cinema*, Barr relates heritage films to „British understatement and the rich British heritage” in some patriotic films of the 1940s, such as Laurence Olivier’s famous screen adaptation of Shakespeare’s historical play *Henry V* and David MacDonald’s *This England* (released in Scotland as *Our Heritage*), which were made to mobilize support for Great Britain’s Second World War effort by presenting England as having a long and unified history (Barr 1986, p. 12). For some critics, the heritage film label is synonymous with the historical film, which portrays „actual figures from history in their historical context” or with costume dramas that present „fictional characters in historical settings” (Higson 2003, p. 12). Ginette Vincendeau argues that heritage films constitute a „genre” only in a loose sense because they often include elements of other genres, such as romance and gothic features, comic scenes, and musical interludes. And she rightly points out that except for the presence of period costume, heritage films are neither defined by a unified iconography (i.e. visual motifs and styles) nor a type of narrative (Vincendeau 2001, p. xviii).

Claire Monk takes the argument a step further in her essay „The British-Heritage Film Debate Revisited” in which she points out that the heritage film may be a literary adaptation, costume drama, or a narrative derived from real history. There exists a broad range of films that fit easily into the category of heritage films. Therefore, the critic argues, the heritage film is not so much a genre itself, since it is made up of various genres such as melodrama, romance, comedy, satire, picaresque, fantasy, action adventure, political thriller, colonial epic, war film, horror, or vampire film (Monk 2002).

In recent film studies, the heritage film is often regarded as part of a „heritage culture” which emerged in the early 1980s as a strategy for promoting Britain and „Britishness”, or more accurately, „Englishness” in terms of the nation’s traditions and past. It is no coincidence that the term „heritage” gained popular currency when the Thatcher government pushed through the National Heritage Acts in 1980 and 1983. Robert Hewison makes a wry comment on the profitable heritage industry emerging in Thatcherite Britain, pointing out that *heritage* in the British context is a diffusive word, which is defined by different people for different reasons: „Instead of manufacturing goods, we are manufacturing *heritage*, a commodity which nobody seems to be able to define, but which everybody is eager to sell” (Hewison 1987, p. 9). And he goes on to say that the heritage phenomenon has been a driving economic force since the 1980 and that the heritage film has played a crucial role in creating a desire for the buying of the huge range of heritage products marketed by the National Trust and English Heritage.

The debate on British heritage films and the concept of „Englishness” has long appealed to film critics and theorists. For instance, Eckart Voigts-Virchow asserts that in the term „heritage”, even though it is medium-unspecific, the transmedial cultural function of film, tourism, literature, educational and historical discourse emerges. Heritage industries, such as cinema, tourism and theme parks, seek to re-establish the past as a property or possession which by „natural” or „naturalized” right of birth belongs to the present or to some current interests or concerns. Voigts-Virchow argues that the concept of heritage emotionalizes space and time by constructing a shared cultural memory, yet he stresses that heritage is a very restrictive notion of cultural memory: „It is diachronic, the preservation of a desirable past (...) which remains a stable utopia across the centuries. It is also a metonymic past because (...) only one part of a given space is loaded with the defining features of a community’s heritage. Thus, heritage space and heritage time amalgamate in leisurely pre-industrial gentry life, a feel-good utopia” (Voigts-Virchow 2007, p. 124).

One can easily see that heritage space in heritage/costume films is staged and invented, but film audiences seem to respond positively to the feel-good factor and are fond of watching the picturesque images of the stately homes of England and the gentrified life-style of a pastoral southern Englishness. The English landscape in heritage films is densely populated by sheep and horses and seems to be unaffected by industrialization or revolution. As a rule, these films are shot on location and key regions include highlands, heaths and moors, West Country, especially the coastlines of Devon, Cornwall, and Kent. Expensive period settings, interior designs, furnishings, horse-drawn carriages and lavish costumes are highly conducive to creating an idealistic version of England and Englishness in heritage films.

There is general agreement among film scholars that two waves can be distinguished as heritage heydays. As noted at the beginning of this paper, the first wave of heritage films emerged in the 1980s. The best known of the early heritage films are the Merchant Ivory’s adaptations of E. M. Forster’s novels, which are chiefly about showcasing of landscapes with picturesque countryside and costume props, about nostalgia for traditional British values, while at the same time marketing those values to international audiences in order to construct a sense of Englishness according to a certain bourgeois ideal of imperial tradition and stability. Higson argues that the distorted perspective adopted by filmmakers in the heritage films produced in the 1980s creates a certain kind of aesthetic: „In this version of history, a critical perspective is displaced by decoration and display (...) a fascination with style displaces the material dimensions of historical context. The past is reproduced as flat, depthless pastiche, where the reference point is not the past itself, but other images, other texts” (Higson 1993, p.112).

Many critics express the opinion that heritage films as well as television adaptations of classic novels could be considered very successful commercials for the British tourist industry. One can easily notice that numerous travel guides to Britain often feature the filming locations and their tourist attractions, thus creating a desire to „see the real thing”. For in-

stance, in an attempt to attract overseas tourism through the popularity of the films and their literary sources, the British Tourist Authority puts out a popular series of „movie maps”, which feature a map of Britain with the film location starred and numbered. In her essay titled *Selling Heritage Culture*, Amy Sargeant remarks wryly that „touristic tie-in” has become big business for some regions because the mere fact of filming at a particular location seems to attract public interest even more than any particular film’s subject matter. And she points out that the activity of cinematic historic reconstruction is further celebrated in such Penguin Books tie-ins as *The Making of „Pride and Prejudice”* and *The Making of Jane Austen’s „Emma”* (Sargeant 2000). It is worth quoting here filmmaker Gerry Scott who revealed that the aim of his production of Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice* was to „film as much as possible on location [i. e. Lyme Park as Pemberley in Austen’s novel] because we wanted to use the English landscape as a player in the film” (Birtwistle and Conklin 1995, p. 37).

In the early 1990s, a second phase of heritage films emerged, which sparked off an intense debate among film critics. Focusing on changes in the British heritage film, many critics note that the visual style of the second-phase heritage films departs from the canonical pattern established by the Merchant Ivory team in the previous decade. The Merchant Ivory’s adaptations of Forster’s novels, which gained prominence at the same time as the expansion of museum culture and theme parks in the 1980s, often provoked derogatory comments, such as the „Laura Ashley school of filmmaking”, the „Merchant-Ivory furniture restoration aesthetic”, or the „white flannel school”. According to Cairn Craig, these adaptations reflect the conflict of a nation committed to an international market place that diminishes the significance of Englishness, while at the same time seeking to assert traditional English values: „If for an international audience the England these films validate and advertise is a theme park of the past, then for an English audience they gratify the need to find points of certainty within English culture” (Craig 2001, p. 4). And the critic goes on to say that these screen adaptations re-create the secure world of an earlier Englishness in which E.M. Forster’s and Evelyn Waugh’s novels are set, i.e. the world before the modernist experiment in literature, rather than what the literary originals acknowledge: that England must change, or has already changed beyond recognition.

Many interesting points were raised during the debate on a second phase of heritage films which are often referred to as „post-heritage” films. Claire Monk asserts that 1990s heritage movies attempt to go beyond the category in both content and marketing. The critic claims that „post-heritage” dates from Sally Potter film *Orlando* (1992), based on Virginia Woolf’s novel, and includes films such as Jane Campion’s *The Piano* (1993) and Christopher Hampton’s *Carrington* (1995). What unites these post-heritage films is an overt concern with sexuality and gender, especially non-dominant gender and sexual identities, including mutable, androgynous, ambiguous (Monk 2001). The screen adaptation of *Orlando*, a fantastic biography of a male favourite of Queen Elizabeth I, who undergoes a sex change and

becomes a woman in the twentieth century, is a prime example of the transgressive sexual politics of the post-heritage cinema. Monk remarks that the transgressive politics of the post-heritage cinema places it in opposition to the 1990s Hollywood-defined mainstream. The transportation of the androgynous protagonist of *Orlando* through two genders and four centuries and, generally speaking, the preoccupations of the post-heritage films would be found „unthinkable deviant”, both sexually and commercially, by the Hollywood of predatory and punitive sexual politics exemplified in such films as *Basic Instinct* (1991) and *Disclosure* (1994).

Another interesting example of the transgressive sexual politics of the British post-heritage cinema is Christopher Hampton's *Carrington* (1995), awarded the *Prix Spécial du Jury à l'unanimité* at the 1995 Cannes Film Festival, which presents the tangled love-life of the Bloomsbury group in unconventional relationships. It deserves mentioning that Christopher Hampton had previously won an Academy Award (i.e. the Oscar) for the screenplay of *Dangerous Liaisons* (1988) based on the famous 18th-century novel by Pierre Choderlos de Laclos. *Carrington* was the directing debut of the British playwright, who also wrote the screenplay. The film draws much of its inspiration from the intense, sexually open relationship between the eminent biographer and essayist Giles Lytton Strachey (1880-1932) and the painter Dora Carrington, thirteen years his junior, who rejected her female first name and chose to wear male clothes. Lytton Strachey, on their first meeting, had mistaken gamine Dora Carrington for a „ravishing” boy. (It is worth explaining here that Strachey preferred boys to women). Both Strachey and Carrington were members of the Bloomsbury Group, a coterie of modernist writers, artists, and intellectuals whose aesthetic, political and sexual experimentations signalled an open break with the values and mores of the Victorian era. Hampton's film focuses on the emotional and sexual life of a woman artist (Emma Thompson was cast as Dora Carrington), who spent the last 16 years of her life in *a ménage à trois* with her husband Ralph Partridge and her lover, and committed suicide following Lytton Strachey's death. It is small wonder, therefore, that *Carrington* received scathing reviews in the quality press when it was released in the mid-1990s.

However, *Carrington* was well received by some critics who point out approvingly that Hampton's film as well as Sally Potter's *Orlando* challenge mainstream representations of gender and sexuality and thus contribute to a reinvention of British heritage cinema. Drawing on feminist and gay scholarship, film critics praise both Hampton and Potter for their ability to treat film audiences across the world to the pleasures of costume and period spectacle associated with the „traditional” heritage cinema, while seeking to distance themselves from the conservatism of the earlier heritage films promoting pastoral „English/British” national identity (Monk 2001; Vincendeau 2001). One of the distancing strategies in British post-heritage cinema is the choice of subject, i.e. the continuing preoccupation with a wide range of „unconventional” sexualities in an attempt to adapt heritage to a modern sensitivity. It is worth mentioning that the political aspect of gay heritage films has not escaped the attention

of film critics who emphasize that such films as *Carrington* and Merchant Ivory's *Maurice*, based on E. M. Forster's semi-autobiographical novel, present a fluid, permeable, and multiple sexual scenario that destabilizes hierarchical status and class-based identity and also exposes the historical decline of country house, gentry rank and the British Empire (Monk 2001; Sadoff 2010). The insistence of filmmakers on filming left-field sexual narrative can be viewed as a strategy of product differentiation from other European heritage cinemas as well as from Hollywood-defined stream.

It is worth noticing that since the 1980s many British heritage films have been repeatedly made by non-British „wandering” companies, such as Merchant Ivory Productions, Miramax Films, and other US studios. Miramax, which was acquired as an autonomous subsidiary by the Walt Disney Company in 1993, gained an international reputation for making profitable heritage/period films, such as highly successful *Shakespeare in Love* (dir. John Madden, 1998), awarded seven Academy Awards, including best picture and original screenplay, written by American director Marc Norman and famous British playwright Tom Stoppard. In contrast to scandalous films such as *Carrington*, *Shakespeare in Love* remains within the bounds of conventional sexual politics. Madden's film, which targets a younger audience, exemplifies the postmodern updating of classics and participates in Elizabethan heritage industry marked by the reconstruction of the famous Globe Theatre in London (destroyed in the 17th century), where Shakespeare's plays were first performed. When watching the movie, one can easily notice that the filmmakers' attitude to the past is different from that displayed in the earlier costume films. Julianne Pidduck argues that Madden's film heralds a new, post-heritage kind of Elizabethan films (Pidduck 2001). Although period costumes, settings, naturalistic *mise-en-scène*, and many historical figures lend historical verisimilitude to the film, the critic writes, authenticity is replaced by „a postmodern irreverence” towards canonical literary or historical texts.

It must be emphasized that *Shakespeare in Love* is not a literary adaptation. There is no „original” literary text for this film because it tells the story of a writer whose personal life is obscure. In their script, Tom Stoppard and Marc Norman chose to dramatize the event of writing a new play by young Shakespeare and thus to involve the audience in the creative process. Madden's film, which can be described as a romantic comedy for the 1990s set in Elizabethan England, oscillates between Will Shakespeare struggling to compose a new play, the rehearsals and the triumphal stage presentation of *Romeo and Juliet*, and the developing love story between the playwright and the beautiful Lady Viola. Viola de Lesseps is contracted by her father to marry Lord Wessex, but she loves Shakespeare and becomes the prototype for Viola in his later comedy. When the film begins, Will Shakespeare is shown writing his new play: he is torn between the need to write a blockbuster because the playhouse is under threat of closure, and his desire to capture the very truth and nature of love in his new play without compromising his artistic aspirations, with the result that he experiences writer's block. The screenwriters borrow freely from Shakespeare's plays and also

from other Elizabethan plays in which disguise and cross-dressing are stock tropes. Thus their script forms a new textual web, an assortment of original Shakespeare's texts (such as *Twelfth Night*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and the sonnets), period costumes and architecture, fictional characters coupled with historical figures, such as Queen Elizabeth, playwright Christopher Marlowe, and famous Elizabethan actor Ned Alleyn.

The film's narrative drive force is strongly heterosexual and keeps to conventional sexuality even in those episodes that are suggestive of homosexuality. For instance, in the scene showing two „men” (i.e. young Will and Viola disguised as Thomas Kent) embracing each other, the transgressive potential of the episode is undercut by the audience's knowledge that Viola's moustache is false and any queer fantasies are dispelled when her breasts are exposed. It is worth mentioning in passing that Viola's cross-dressing in the film also prompts a feminist critique of the long historical ban on the presence of women on stage in England. Commenting on *Shakespeare in Love*, Julianne Pidduck writes that sex, intrigue, raw physicality and violence distinguish this new Elizabethan film from a largely „demure” British tradition. And she notes that post-heritage Elizabethan films such as *Shakespeare in Love* and Shekhar Kapur's *Elizabeth* (1998) present the early modern English as „creatures of passion and tragic romance”, of slapstick humour and bawdy wordliness: „Their crucial difference could be distilled down to costume and what lies underneath. The stiff geometrical shapes, bristling lace ruffs, elaborate gowns encrusted in gold embroidery and jewels all belie an underlying raw sexual energy. (...) these elaborate costumes conceal some of the most lissome bodies in the biz” (Pidduck 2001, p.135).

Needless to say, these post-heritage Elizabethan films boast all-star international casts clad in period costumes, combining American, French, and Australian film actors with the British „quality” performers, including Judi Dench, Colin Firth, and Joseph Fiennes. This mix of accents, star personas and acting styles provides the enormous pleasures of make-believe so essential for costume drama and period films. To take just one example, Gwyneth Paltrow, winner of the Oscar as the best actress, who illustrates the role of the American performer in heritage/costume films, is widely praised for her „perfect” British accent and her ability to „pass” in British heritage cinema, while remaining Pure Hollywood.

As noted earlier, *Shakespeare in Love* tells a compelling yet made-up story about the writer who has been dead for four centuries. There exist only few concrete details about the writer's life with the result that the Shakespeare mystique resembles the black hole that historians and literary scholars are unable to fill. John Madden is famously quoted (in Miramax Films promotional blurb) as saying that the point about Shakespeare's life is that nobody knows anything: „All we know is that he paid 50 pounds to join the Chamberlain's Men and that in his will he left his second best bed to his wife – that's about the sum of it”. However, what distinguishes Madden's unconventional biopic from the films produced in the first phase of British heritage cinema is that it „deterritorializes” the stories about the Elizabethan playwright and „reterritorializes” the Bard into the role that is similar to that of a contem-

porary screenwriter. Jenniffer Jeffers argues that „Shakespeare” is the twenty-first century’s „ultimate signifier because the signifier, Shakespeare, never connects to the signified, a material Shakespeare” (Jeffers 2012, pp. 207-208). Alluding to Michel Foucault’s seminal essay „What Is an Author?”, the critic writes that thousands of pages of signifiers have tried to make Shakespeare „a transcendent signifier” and that Shakespeare’s name carries with it an endless series of discursive practices. The fact that a film about a writer who has been dead for nearly four-hundred years could gross over one-hundred-million dollars at the box-office a few months after its release, Jeffers notes, tells us something about the Bard’s ongoing popularity as well as about how the „ultimate signifier” was packaged for the big screen.

It deserves mentioning that Madden’s film abounds in references to Hollywood and film industry in general which serve to draw a parallel between Shakespeare’s time and contemporary Hollywood. Thus the great Elizabethan playwright and poet is reterritorialized to fit into the mould of a typical Hollywood screenwriter fighting for survival. In addition to remaking Shakespeare into an innovative and imaginative entrepreneur in the entertainment business, the filmmakers utilized international film-star capital. One can easily observe that these stars bring to Shakespeare humour coupled with rapid cuts and fast action typical of Hollywood films. The filmmakers also changed the traditional image of Shakespeare: the stodgy middle-aged, balding Bard has been transformed into sexy and dynamic „Will”.

More importantly, *Shakespeare in Love* may serve as an illustration of how the American film industry fabricates British literary and colonial history, including biographical data about historical figures. One cannot fail to notice that Maiden’s film anachronistically writes the New World into the story which ends in America, somewhere on the shores of Virginia. In the final sequence Will Shakespeare is shown writing Viola into his new play. The film’s ending evoked mixed responses from cultural scholars. For instance, American scholar Courtney Lehman comments favourably on the final scene in which Shakespeare’s handwriting is superimposed on the image of Viola trekking across the beach of the New World. For Lehman, this scene imaginatively connects the Bard to America as it „brilliantly relocates Shakespeare the Author from early Modern England to our own postmodern consumer society, recycling the Bard (...) as the day dream believer of Southern California: Hollywood” (Lehmann 2002, p. 231). Yet the film’s coda also provoked negative responses from some scholars who are fearful about the usurpation of British culture by the American media. In her book, *Britain Colonized*, Jeffers points out disapprovingly that the inclusion of the New World in the final scene suggests that America has reterritorialized and colonized Britain by literally remapping the world and rewriting history. For her, the fact that Britain reterritorializes itself in the image of „an American film-set on location in Britain” is disconcerting (Jeffers 2012).

The films discussed above illustrate how British heritage cinema, which is widely viewed as part of a strategy for promoting Britain and Britishness/Englishness, evolved and responded to social and cultural changes in the last decades of the 20th century. Early heritage

films share a number of formal and ideological traits, such as: a nostalgic celebration of traditional national values and lifestyles of the privileged classes, heavy reliance on canonical literary works, and showcasing of English landscapes. In the 1990s, a second-phase of heritage films emerged. Although second-phase films, funded and coproduced by international film companies, continue to disseminate heritage culture, one can observe a marked change in attitude towards British literature and history. Generally speaking, these films propose a radical revision of British history and culture, depicting the decline of the British house, the British Empire, and the nation. The 1990s heritage movies are also more open to „unconventional” sexualities and illustrate the ability of heritage to widen the gender and sexual cinematic horizon.

Bibliography

- Barr C. (1986), *Introduction: Amnesia and Schizophrenia*, (in:) Barr C. (Ed.), *All Our Yesterdays: 90 Years of British Cinema*, British Film Institute, London.
- Birtwistle S., Conklin S. (1995), *The Making of „Pride and Prejudice”*, Penguin Books/BBC Books, London.
- Craig C. (2001), *Rooms Without a View*, (in:) Vincendeau G. (Ed.), *Film/Literature/Heritage*, British Film Institute, London.
- Hayward S. (2013), *Cinema Studies. The Key Concepts*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Hewison R. (1987), *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline*, Methuen, London.
- Higson A. (1993), *Re-presenting the National Past: Nostalgia and Pastiche in Heritage Film*, (in:) Friedman L. (Ed.), *Fires Were Started: British Cinema and Thatcherism*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Higson A. (2003), *English Heritage, English Cinema: Costume Drama since 1980*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Jeffers J.M. (2012), *Britain Colonized. Hollywood's Appropriation of British Literature*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Lehmann C. (2002), *Shakespeare Remains: Theater to Film, Early Modern to Postmodern*, Cornell University Press, New York.
- Monk C. (2001), *Sexuality and Heritage*, (in:) Vincendeau G. (Ed.), *Film/Literature/Heritage*, British Film Institute, London.
- Monk C. (2002), *The British Heritage-Film Debate Revisited*, (in:) Monk C., Sargeant A. (Eds.), *British Historical Cinema. The History, Heritage and Costume Film*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Pidduck, J. (2001), „Elizabeth” and „Shakespeare in Love”: *Screening the Elizabethans*, (in:) Vincendeau G. (Ed.), *Film/Literature/Heritage*, British Film Institute, London.
- Sadoff D.F. (2010), *Victorian Vogue. British Novels on Screen*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis and London.
- Sargeant A. (2000), *Selling Heritage Culture*, (in:) Asby J., Higson A. (Eds.), *British Cinema, Past and Present*, Routledge, London.
- Vincendeau G. (2001), *Introduction*, (in:) Vincendeau G. (Ed.), *Film/Literature/Heritage*, British Film Institute, London.

Voigts-Virchow E. (2010), *Heritage and Literature on Screen*, (in:) Cartmell D., Whelehan I. (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Brytyjskie filmy nurtu dziedzictwa kulturowego w latach 80.tych i 90.tych

Streszczenie

Filmy nurtu dziedzictwa kulturowego zrealizowane w ostatnich dekadach XX wieku spotkały się z żywym zainteresowaniem krytyki filmowej i literackiej. Pierwsza część artykułu przedstawia główne wątki refleksji filmoznawczej i literaturoznawczej na temat tego zjawiska w kontekście głębokich przemian społecznych i kulturowych na Wyspach Brytyjskich. W części drugiej omówione zostały kolejne fazy rozwojowe i proces międzynarodowej ekspansji tego nurtu. W późniejszej fazie, szczególnie w latach 90.tych, „brytyjskie” z nazwy filmy dziedzictwa kulturowego stały się ważnym segmentem międzynarodowego przemysłu filmowego.

Słowa kluczowe: film dziedzictwa kulturowego, dramat kostiumowy, dziedzictwo kulturowe, adaptacje literackie, *Orlando*, *Carrington*, *Shakespeare in Love*.

Artykuł zaakceptowany do druku w styczniu 2019 roku

Afiliacja:

prof. dr hab. Andrzej Weseliński

Akademia Finansów i Biznesu Vistula

Wydział Filologii

ul. Stokłosa 3

02-787 Warszawa

e-mail: a.weselinski@vistula.edu.pl