

Medieval Women in Film

An Annotated Handlist and Reference Guide,
with Essays on Teaching *The Sorceress*

EDITED BY

Virginia Blanton, Martha M. Johnson-Olin,
and Charlene Miller Avrich

Medieval Feminist Forum

Subsidia Series, Volume 1, second edition



Contents

Preface to the Second Edition 3

Introduction 5

Annotated Handlist of Films

Women in History 12

Women in Literature 28

Women in Folklore 59

References

Teaching with Film 75

Teaching *The Sorceress*, Criticism and Reviews 79

Essays on Teaching *The Sorceress*

Fiona Harris Stoertz, "Teaching The Sorceress" 82

Constance Brittain Bouchard, "The Sorceress and
The Greyhound" 88

Mary A. Suydam, "Under the Spell of the Sorceress:
The Allure of the Medieval" 96

Lisa M. Bitel, "*The Sorceress* as an Interpretative Tool in
Medieval History Classes" 105

Jacqueline Jenkins, "Film, Women, and History" 111

Margarett Jewett, "Water Down the Ventriloquist's Throat:
Testing the Voice of the Middle Ages on Film" 121

Appendix 129

Preface to the Second Edition

WHEN FIRST PUBLISHED IN 2000, *Medieval Women and Film* appeared as the first issue of a subsidia series of the *Medieval Feminist Forum*, and it met with an overwhelming response. In 1999 as part of a film festival at the International Congress on Medieval Studies at Western Michigan University (Kalamazoo, Michigan), the Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship had begun to sponsor a film screening and special session on women and film, a project it continued for over ten years. The films and sessions topics ranged widely from performances of women's liturgical writing (Hildegard's *Ordo Virtutum*) to presentations of women in history (*The Lion in Winter*) to portrayals of women in literature (*Kristin Lavransdattar*). The interest generated by these sessions, as well as a particular interest then in teaching the Middle Ages on film, led to the first edition of *Medieval Women and Film* quickly being sold out. In 2006, a second printing was completed and again sold out. In 2007, Martha Johnson-Olin, then a master's student and my research assistant at the University of Missouri-Kansas City, agreed to research any films of interest that had appeared since 1999. After going on to a doctoral program at the University of Rochester, Martha continued to compile films and write annotations, and her investment in providing an updated handlist has made this second edition possible.

The list of films has been augmented by new releases, the references section has been updated, and an appendix of the films and special sessions sponsored by the Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship at the International Congress on Medieval Studies at Kalamazoo has been added.¹ A few editorial changes have been made, including deleting suggestions from annotations on how a particular film might be used in

1. As a way to group like films, a + is used before a series of films on the same subject, such as all of those following the general entry for Arthurian Legends. A ++ indicates those on the same character, such as Tristan.

the classroom. The introduction and the individual essays by scholars remain substantially unchanged as they provide a specific lens into the original theoretical and pedagogical aims of the project. Obviously, there have been enormous changes in the Internet since the advent of the first edition, so we remind users that web searching options may vary over time, even as websites can be unstable. The benefits of making this publication available more widely as an open access publication on the website of *Medieval Feminist Forum*, the Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship's journal, however, far outweigh the losses incurred by the instability of URLs. In any case, it is hoped that in providing this second edition as an open-access film guide, we will continue to help scholars and teachers challenge students to engage with and reconsider the ways in which women were important agents in the medieval period.

VB

Introduction

WHEN A QUERY about the use of movies in teaching appeared on the MEDFEM listserv, it generated several responses about the pedagogical value films offer. This brief but lively exchange intimated that a number of educators use cinematic materials to supplement readings in history and literature courses. In that discussion, several interesting films—some well-known and others obscure—were mentioned along with incomplete references as to where they might be found. Anne Marie Rasmussen, then editor of the *Medieval Feminist Newsletter* (now *Medieval Feminist Forum*), suggested that a bibliography of film, specifically focused on images of medieval women, would make a useful contribution. Laurie Brandt, who made her personal film database available to us, deserves special mention. Her collection extensively surveys a large number of films about medieval cultures in the West and in the East, and it provided a starting point for this handlist. Three of the four original volunteers slated to work on this project, however, had to bow out because of time constraints, and Charlene Miller Avrich, a free-lance script writer, generously volunteered to help select, categorize, and research the films, as well as write many of the annotations that accompany them in this handlist. Of late, Meghan Conrad, a student at Marist College, has been largely responsible for checking the running times of movies and the website addresses, for which we are profoundly grateful.

By selectively extracting films from Laurie Brandt's database, as well as from several other film listings published on the Internet such as "Medieval Movies" in the Medieval Sourcebook, we compiled a number of movies that seemed good candidates for our project, which defines "medieval" as the time period between 400 and 1500 CE, primarily in western Europe. In addition, we divided the films into three categories: historical women or images of women set in an historical context; depictions of women in literature (including later depictions of medieval women such as Hugo's *Hunchback of Notre Dame*); and women in

folklore. Within each category, an asterisk denotes the films that focus only partially on women or in which women have secondary or only a minor role in the plot. This designation will more than underscore how often film represents medieval women in secondary roles, usually in the role of damsel in distress, elegant queen/consort, the daughter of a sworn enemy who becomes a marital trophy, or the folkloric Cinderella. Contrasted with some films that focus on women's achievements, these seem relatively worthless for scholarly work, yet in themselves, they offer a significant point of discussion regarding women and representation.

The films included here focus on women from the European Middle Ages, and often, they are idealized portraits of medieval life based on twentieth-century perceptions. The difficulty in finding useful cinematic representations of women remains a problem, especially since Hollywood has tended to limit the Middle Ages to life in medieval England, France, or Spain. The Low Countries are seldom depicted, and Scandinavian cultures are usually represented in terms of the Viking raids. The cinematic focus on men and warfare, moreover, limits the images of women in film to the prize won through combat. We have found, however, several very worthwhile films; the overwhelming majority fit the "women in history" category.

The Anchoress, Hildegard, and *Stealing Heaven* focus specifically on the lives of historical women, and they offer rich textual material for discussion. We would argue, however, that using contemporary depictions of women in history deserves the critical focus we give to accounts written by medieval historians—an engagement that locates contextual material and questions the representations of women. Film provides a way to study the Middle Ages, but more significantly, it details the reception of medieval studies in contemporary society. *Stealing Heaven*, for instance, focuses on the passion of Héloïse and Abelard and contextualizes Abelard's clerical position, if not Héloïse's education in medieval rhetorical forms. By contrast, the representations of Hildegard below offer a more dynamic study since they focus on various aspects of her spirituality and creativity, as well as her biography, but again, each exhibits a bias: *Hildegard* is a dramatization of her arrest and heresy trial in 1148, *Radiant Life* discusses her life, writings, and music; and *Hildegard of Bingen* is a video celebration of her work and spirituality designed for religious

study. Although each is useful in its own right, these together would provide a way for students to understand and discuss different interpretations of Hildegard's work, as well as the reception of Hildegard in the twentieth century.

While there are several "re-enactments" of historical life, and a number of films about historical women such as Joan of Arc, we discovered that there are very few adaptations of medieval literary representations of women, but many that are adaptations of post-medieval written accounts. We opted to include the latter category for scholars who are interested in studying the ways in which medieval women have been constructed in later periods and for those who are interested in the intertextuality of these narratives. Medieval literature has also tempted cinematographers, albeit with little success. The bawdy Pasolini films based on Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* and Boccaccio's *Decameron* might be useful for a cultural studies review that discusses the way images of medieval women have been received historically, but many educators might find them unsuitable for teaching the "Wife of Bath's Tale," for instance. We included videos of the York Cycle Pageant and several of the films from the Arthurian tradition to broaden this category, but we found few films specially based on medieval literature. It would be exciting to see both historical and literary adaptations written by scholars, like the one Pamela Berger produced entitled *The Sorceress*, which she based partially on Étienne de Bourbon's account of a female healer in medieval France.

Since the literary depictions of women in film are so heavily concentrated in the literary work of more recent authors, we also opted to include a category for women in folklore. Folkloric tales often detail the lives of women in ways historical or literary accounts do not, and thus, they seem important for the ways in which they represent women. In addition, they are suggestive repositories of non-authoritative storytelling. Unlike the powerful positions of established historians or literature writers of the medieval period, oral storytelling, at times, escapes the confines of the courtly love ethos and the requisite class hierarchies to focus on the poor and the humble. Marie de France's *lais* *Lanval* and *Le Fresne* offer an interesting counterpoint to tales such as "Cinderella."

While oral stories sometimes predate and antedate the medieval

period, many tales circulated in the Middle Ages. The films included here, *Sleeping Beauty*, *Snow White*, and *Beauty and the Beast*, detail the passivity of women and the violence enacted on them, but they also demonstrate some of the ways in which women were categorized in medieval romance specifically. Film versions of fairy tales, moreover, offer insightful reflections on contemporary society and our views on medieval romance, and they illustrate a way to examine medieval romance as a genre that has been influenced by oral tales. For instance, I have designed and taught a course called “Conventions of Romance,” in which students read Middle English and Old French texts, such as *Havelock the Dane*, *The Tournament of Tottenham*, *Erec et Enide*, and *Aucassin et Nicolette*, against early modern and contemporary romances, such as William Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale*, Charlotte Brontë’s *Jane Eyre*, and Zora Neale Hurston’s *Their Eyes Were Watching God*. In tandem, students read feminist criticism that describes the social construction of gender roles and investigate early renditions of fairy tales to understand how ideas of love have developed in western culture. A course writing project requires that students choose a fairy tale, research its history, variations, and current criticism, then write a critique of two versions of the tale in light of the medieval conventions of romance discussed earlier in the class. The course is designed to illustrate ways to bring cultural studies to bear on medieval studies, to illuminate echoes of medieval ideology in contemporary society, as well as to stimulate student interest in medieval studies. Fairy tale films, particularly Disney versions, help to locate the importance of gender roles and class in contemporary society and provide a rich discussion of contemporary idealization of medieval society.

A number of films offer a similar context for discussions of medieval life in general. Some of those included, while seemingly too focused around men, warfare, and quest motifs to fit into a compilation on medieval women, might be more effective if only short clips were edited from them and used to supplement course readings. For instance, it can be valuable to look at several depictions of a medieval character in literature or several different accounts of an historical woman. Short clips from Arthurian films, for example, could focus class attention on the women, including Guinevere, Morgan le Fay, and Elaine.

In no way is this handlist exhaustive or complete, and many of the

films included do not have full details about directors and cast. To offset this problem, we have included a limited reference section, which includes several sample articles on teaching with film, film databases and film guides, and an eclectic list of web pages focused on women's studies, film journals, and cultural studies. Publications, such as Pamela Berger's "The Film '*Sorceress*': A Twentieth-Century Re-Creation of a Medieval Memory," offer excellent supplementary class readings, commenting on the Middle Ages, contemporary medieval studies, and our perceptions of women. Undoubtedly, many more are available to the diligent researcher. For some time, teaching Arthurian studies through film has been a popular method, and many of the articles listed focus more generally on using film in medieval studies courses. The methods, however, should be useful for thinking about a class syllabus on medieval women. We note, too, that for the last several years, the International Congress on Medieval Studies has offered special sessions on film, and in 1999, Alan Lupack, Kevin Harty, and I organized the inaugural film festival, which included a session on *The Sorceress* sponsored by the Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship. The session generated a large audience and much animated conversation about the multiple ways to use film in college courses. As a result, we are delighted to include here the three papers presented in that session by Jacqueline Jenkins, Mary Suydam, and Constance Brittain Bouchard, as well as three others by Lisa Bitel, Fiona Harris Stoertz, and Margaret Jewell that broaden the pedagogical discussion. Together, they provide a rich collection of ideas about the fruitfulness and dangers of using film to discuss medieval people and their lives. The second annual film festival will feature a session on the film, *The Passion of Joan of Arc*, co-sponsored by SMFS and the new International Joan of Arc Society. Hopefully, it, too, will lead to vigorous debate.

We encourage readers to use the World Wide Web as a valuable source of information about well-known and obscure films, especially films about women outside of medieval Europe. The film databases listed in the reference section offer plot lines, reviews, and a list of cast members, and fairly mainstream movies can usually be bought directly from a web database. When a video is not widely available in rental stores, we have

keyed it to a database in the reference section.² Many of the documentaries, for instance, are available through Canada's International Film Board, whose web page offers reviews and prices for rental or purchase, as do the pages for PBS, BBC, and British Videos. We do caution readers that the addresses of web pages can change, and sometimes, the pages are taken off the web. Having the technological resources and the "know-how" for Internet searches, therefore, will aid teachers in supplementing courses with film.

Our reference section on feminist film journals is relatively small. We have listed a few online publications but have avoided an exhaustive search since there are so many online and print journals available. Checking a national research database like RLIN [now WorldCat] will be helpful in locating books and journals devoted to women in film, as will an online database like FirstSearch. We found that narrowing the search to medieval women in film did not provide a more select group of references sources. Obviously, there are few film resources devoted specifically to images of medieval women, but a careful review of the large group of film resources will help educators determine the most profitable use of film in their courses. One exception is the recently published book by Kevin Harty: *The Reel Middle Ages: American, Western and Eastern European, Middle Eastern and Asian Films About Medieval Europe*. Harty's scope, which far exceeds the present work, encompasses all available film about the medieval period, and he has provided an extensive and valuable list that includes more fully developed plot lines, as well as bibliographic information for film reviews. We encourage users of this narrowly focused handlist to use Harty's text as the next step in researching these films. His resource will help scholars expand their reading lists about medieval film, even as it has assisted us in providing here several entries about which we did not know, including the extensive list of films on Faust, Geneviève de Brabant, Jane Shore, and Pia de' Tolomei. We want to thank him especially, since we would not have been

2. Nota Bene: Various databases in the reference section are no longer available on the Internet, so they have been removed from the revised reference section and individual film annotations no longer suggest where these films might be found.

able to flesh out this handlist so fully without his definitive collection.

Finally, the brief annotations provided for each film included here are not intended as film reviews or as evaluations of women's roles in the films, though we have tried to note plots that focus on the women's roles and their participation in the films. Since there are many movies that we have not seen, it is likely that the handlist includes several "bad" films. Standard film guides are not always reliable sources because the majority of movies focus on men in the Middle Ages, and not surprisingly, most of the guides (almost always written and evaluated by men) provide plot details that ignore women's roles or diminish the importance of these roles to the story line. When we could not locate enough information to assess a film's treatment of women, we opted to leave them out. Alternatively, when we found a substantial review of the film, we provided suggestions about how it might complement a medieval text or how it might be used in combination with other films.³ We hope this reference guide will be useful for scholars and educators alike, and we would be grateful to receive commentary or reactions to the list.

VBW

3. All such suggestions have been deleted from the second edition.

Annotated Handlist of Films

A. WOMEN IN HISTORY

The Advocate (1993, 102 min.). Director: Leslie Megahy. With Nichol Williamson, Colin Firth, Ian Holm, Amina Annabi. Production: Miramax Films; British Broadcasting Corporation; CIB4, 2000.

Depicts archetypal women (witch, prostitute, dark-skinned exotic, gypsy, blond/fair daughter) in medieval France.

Agnese Visconti (1910). Director: Giovanni Pastrone. With Emilio Ghione. Production: Itala Film.

Based on Felice Cavallotti's 1873 verse drama *Agnese*, which focused on the life of Agnes Visconti and her arranged marriage to Francesco I Gonzaga, who accuses her of adultery, tries her, and beheads her.

Anchoress (1993, 108 min.). Director: Chris Newby. With Annette Badland, Brenda Bertin, Eugene Bervoets. The Middle Ages on Film series. Production: British Film Institute.

Based on a letter written by the Bishop of Winchester about Christine Carpenter, a fourteenth-century anchoress of Shere in Surrey.

Behind the Veil: Nuns Part I (1984, 131 min.) Director: Margaret Wescott. Production: Signe Johansson and Kathleen Shannon; National Film Board (Canada), Studio D.

Global perspective on the history and achievements of women in religion from pre-Celtic communities to radical sisters of the 1980s. Includes abbesses of the Middle Ages, paintings, books, tapestries, and manuscripts. Also of interest: *Beyond the Veil: Nuns Part II* (activist nuns speak about their convictions and the need to redefine the church).

The Borgias (2011–13, 50 min.). Director: Varies. With Jeremy Irons, Holliday Grainger, Joanne Whalley. Production: Take 5 Productions, Mid Atlantic Films.

Set in late fifteenth-century Italy, series focuses on several female characters, including Lucrezia.

*Braveheart** (1995, 177 min.). Director: Mel Gibson. With Sophie Marceau, Mel Gibson, Patrick McGoohan, Catherine McCormack. Production: Paramount.

Despite historical inaccuracy, two prominent women, the Princess of Wales and Braveheart's (William Wallace) childhood sweetheart, play integral roles in Braveheart's fight against King Edward I.

BOUDICA: These films present the Iceni queen.

+*Warrior Queen Boudica* (2003, 98 min.). Director: Bill Anderson. With Alex Kingston, Steven Waddington, Emily Blunt, Leanne Rowe. Production: Box TV.

Shown on PBS; many reviews criticized the film's lack of historical accuracy.

+*Warrior Queen Boudica* (2006). Directors: Patrick Taulère and Kim Hawkins. With Charlotte Comer, Simona Cuciurianu, Danny Green. Production: Indigo Films.

Television special; in English and Latin.

Burning Times (1990, 56 min.). Director: Donna Read. Producers: Mary Armstrong and Margaret Pettigrew. Production: Studio D, National Film Board Canada.

Part 2 of the Women and Spirituality trilogy, this documentary about witch hunts includes a discussion of medieval responses. Also available are parts 1 and 3, *Goddess Remembered* (a retrospective of goddess-worshiping religions of the ancient past) and *Full Circle* (contemporary women's spirituality in the West).

EL CID: Although focused on battle, these films deal with the eleventh-century arranged marriage of Jimene Díaz to Rodrigo Díaz, otherwise known as El Cid.

+*El Cid** (1961, 184 min.). Director: Anthony Mann. With Sophia Loren, Charlton Heston. Production: Samuel Bronston Productions.

+*El Cid: La leyenda** [*El Cid: The Legend*] (2003, 90 min.). Director: Josep Pozo. Voices of Manuel Fuentes, Sancho Gracia, Natalia Verbeke. Production: Castelao Producciones.

Animated version; in Spanish; German version runs 83 minutes.

+*The Sword of El Cid* (also known as *Las hijas del Cid* and *La spada del Cid*)* (1962, 85 min.). Director: Miguel Iglesias. With Chantal Deberg, Roland Carey, Sandro Moretti. Production: Alexandra Cinematografica.

*La Commanderie** (2010, 52 min.). Director: Didier Le Pécheur. With Clément Sibony, Louise Pasteau, Carlo Brandt. Production: Tétr Média.

Television series, eight episodes; story of French nobility during the Hundred Years War; in French.

THE CRUSADES: Many films on this period offer limited female roles.

+*The Crusades** (1935, 127 min.). Director: Cecil B. DeMille. With Loretta Young, Katherine DeMille, Henry Wilcomon. Production: Paramount.

Focuses on Richard I and Berengaria in Palestine, including her captivity by Saladin.

+*Das Blut der Templer** [*Blood of the Templars, Code of the Templars*] (2004, 180 min.). Director: Florian Baxmeyer. With Harald Krassnitzer, Mirko Lang, Catherine H. Flemming. Production: Lietuvos Kinostudija.

Focuses on a high school student who inherits the ability to find the Grail due to his Templar ancestors; in German.

+*Arn: The Knight Templar** (2007, 139 min.). Director: Peter Flinth. With Joakim Nätterqvist, Sofia Helin. Production: AMC Pictures; Svensk Filmindustri; English, 2010, Entertainment One.

Story of a Swedish nobleman and the Crusades; heroine as love interest; original. in Swedish. The German version runs 270 minutes.

+*The Last Templar* (2009, 170 min.). Director: Paolo Barzman. With Mira Sorvino, Scott Foley, Anthony Lemke. Production: Muse Entertainment Enterprises.

Television miniseries based on the novel of the same name by Raymond Khoury; modern-day woman faces medieval adventures while seeking out artifacts of the Templars.

+*Kingdom of Heaven* [*Königreich der Himmel* or *Reino de los cielos*] (2005, 148 min.). Director: Ridley Scott. With Orlando Bloom, Liam Neeson, Eva Green. Production: Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corporation.

A young blacksmith travels to Jerusalem and becomes involved in the conflict between King Baldwin and Saladin. The film adds a romance between Balian, the main character, and Sibylla, the queen. Director's cut runs 190 minutes and expands the role of Sibylla significantly.

+*Kruistocht in spijkerbroek** [*Crusade: A March Through Time, Crusade in Jeans*] (2006, 126 min.). Director: Ben Sombogaart. With Joe Flynn, Stephanie Leonidas. Production: Kasander Film Company.

Based on the book *Crusade in Jeans* by Thea Beckman; female character added to the film.

Giovanna I d'Angiò, regine di Napoli (1920). Director: Gemma Stagno Bellincioni. With Lea Campioni, Alfredo Campioni, Signora Cei. Production: Bellincioni Film.

Based on the life of Joanna I of Naples (d. 1382), follows the intrigue surrounding her short reign and her murder by relatives.

Giulia Colonna [also known as *Julie Colonna*] (1910). Director: Enrico Guazzoni. Production: Società Italiana Cines.

Based on the rivalry of two Roman families, focuses on the imprisonment of Giulia by the rival Orsinis.

HILDEGARD OF BINGEN: Although very differently, the following films address aspects of the life of Hildegard, a twelfth-century visionary, musician, philosopher, artist, and abbess.

+*Hildegard* (1994, 52 min.). Director: James Runcie. With Patricia Routledge. Production: Gateway Productions.

Dramatization of events that led to Hildegard's arrest and heresy trial in 1148.

+*Hildegard of Bingen* (1989, 60 min.). Production: Morehouse Publications.

Four fifteen-minute segments with study guide celebrate the life, work, and spirituality of Hildegard.

+*Radiant Life: Meditations and Visions of Hildegard von Bingen* (1996, 40 min.). Performed by Lauren Antress. Production: Wellspring Media.

Presents Hildegard's life, music, and writings.

+*Hildegard von Bingen: Eine Frau des 12. Jahrhunderts* (1998, 54 min.). Director: Maria Schönfeld. Production: 3Sat, Arte, Zweites Deutsches Fernsehen (ZDF).

Documentary; in German.

+*Vision: From the Life of Hildegard von Bingen* (2009, 110 min.).
Director: Margarethe von Trotta. With Barbara Sukowa, Heino
Ferch, Hanna Herzsprung. Production: Zeitgeist Films.

Presents Hildegard as a challenger of patriarchy; in German and
Latin.

Illuminated Lives: A Brief History of Women's Work in the Middle Ages
(6 min.). Director: Ellen Besen. Production: National Film Board of
Canada.

Animated; everyday life of medieval women (sixth to sixteenth
century) with a look at specific tasks performed according to class
and location; based on medieval manuscript illuminations.

Inside the Medieval Mind: Sex (2008, 59 min.). Director: Dominic
Sutherland. Writer: Robert Bartlett. Production: Open University/
British Broadcasting Corporation.

Educational video; discusses Christine of Markyate and Héloïse
d'Argenteuil.

JANE SHORE: The title character of these four films is based on the
real-life mistress of Edward IV, who was excommunicated for witch-
craft and stoned to death.

+*Jane Shore* (1908). Production: Gaumont British Picture Corporation.

Based on a play by Nicholas Rowe.

+*Jane Shore* (1912). Director: Frank Powell. With Florence Baker.
Production: Britannia Films/Pathé Frères.

+*Jane Shore* [also known as *The Strife Eternal*] (1915). Directors: F.
Martin Thornton and Bert Haldane. With Blanche Forsythe, Roy
Travers, Robert Purdie. Production: Barker/Walturdaw.

+*Jane Shore* (1922). Director: Edwin J. Collins. With Sybil Thorndike.
Production: Master Films.

JOAN OF ARC: Based on the life of the peasant girl who led the French army against the English. Most of the following films include some representation of her trial for heresy and her subsequent execution (some reviews of films provided at the online Saint Joan of Arc Center).

+*Das Mädchen Johanna* (1935, 87 min.). Director: Gustav Ucicky. With René Deltgen, Angela Salloker, Gustaf Gründgens. Production: Universum Film (UFA).

Produced for Nazi Germany.

+*Giovanna d'Arco* (1989). Directors: Keith Cheetham and Werner Herzog. With Renato Bruson, Susan Dunn. Production: British Broadcasting Corporation.

Film of Giuseppe Verdi's opera.

+*Giovanna d'Arco al rogo* [also known as *Joan at the Stake*] (1954). Director: Roberto Rossellini. With Ingrid Bergman, Tullio Carminati. Production: Produzione Cinematografiche Associate.

Based on Paul Claudel and Arthur Honneger's *Jeanne d'Arc au bûcher*, this is the second Bergman performance.

+*In Search of History*: "Joan of Arc Virgin Warrior" (50 min.). Production: A&E (for The History Channel).

+*Jean d'Arc* (1897). Director: Georges Méliès. With Mlle. Calvière, Georges Méliès, Madame Méliès. Production: Star Films.

+*Jean d'Arc* [also known as *Joan of Arc* and *La Vie de Jeanne d'Arc*] (1909). Director: Albert Capellani. With Léontine Massart. Production: Pathé Frères.

+*Jeanne la Pucelle I: Les batailles* (1994, 160 min.). Director: Jacques Rivette. With Sandrine Bonnaire, Tatiana Moukhine, Jean-Marie Richier. Production: France 3 Cinéma.

Focuses on Joan's leadership until her imprisonment.

+*Jeanne la Pucelle II: Les prisons* (1994, 176 min.). Director: Jacques Rivette. With Sandrine Bonnaire, André Marcon, Jean-Louis Richard. Production: Pierre Grise Productions.

The sequel to *Les batailles*, *Les prisons* details Joan's imprisonment, the trial, and her death.

+*Joan of Arc* (1913). Director: Ubaldo Maria Del Colle. With Maria Jacobini, Alberto Nepoti, Mario Ronconi. Production: Savoia Film.

+*Joan of Arc* (1948, 100 min.; also available in 155 min. length). Director: Victor Fleming. With Ingrid Bergman, Jose Ferrar. Production: RKO.

Adaptation of Maxwell Anderson's play about the Hundred Years War, which chronicles Joan's life from Domremy to her death.

+*Joan of Arc* (50 min.). Production: PBS/The Learning Channel.

Included in the *Passion of the Saints* series as volume 1, along with *Catherine of Siena* (volume 2); and *Mary Magdalen: An Intimate Portrait* (volume 3).

+*Joan of Arc* (1999, 140 min.). Director: Christian Duguay. With Leelee Sobieski, Peter O'Toole, Olympia Dukakis. Production: Alliance Atlantis Films for CBS Television.

+*Joan of Arc* [*Joan of Arc: Child of War, Soldier of God*] (2005, 60 min.). Director: Pamela Mason Wagner. With Anna Paquin, Alfred Molina. Production: International Production Company.

Television docudrama.

+*Johanka z Arku* [Joan of Arc] (2003, 132 min.). Director: Jozef Bednárík. With Lucie Bílá, Jan Apolenár, Vladimír Marek. Production: Česká Televize.

Czech musical from the Czech Republic.

+*Joan of Arc* (1996, 30 min.). Director: Richard Rich. Voices of Bridget Connors, Mark Hunt. Production: Nest Family Entertainment

Animated version of the story that includes the twenty years following Joan's death to show how views changed regarding her status as a heretic; part of The Animated Hero Classics series.

+*Jeanne d'Arc* (2004, 50 min.). Director: Laurent Preyale. Production: Almagordo Films et Spectacles.

Ballet.

+*Joan of Arcadia* (2003, 60 min.). Director: Varies. With Amber Tamblyn, Joe Montegna, Mary Steenburgen. Production: Barbara Hall Productions, CBS Productions.

Television series set around a teenager who hears the voice of God.

+*Joan the Woman* (1916, 100 min.). Director: Cecil B. DeMille. With Geraldine Farrar, Raymond Hatton, Hobart Bosworth. Production: Paramount.

+*La merveilleuse vie de Jeanne d'Arc* [also known as *The Marvelous Life of Joan of Arc* and *Saint Joan the Maid*] (1929, 125 min.). Director: Marco de Gastyne. With Simone Genevois, Philippe Hériat, Choura Milena. Production: Production Natan.

+*The Messenger: the Story of Joan of Arc* (1999, 148 min.). Director: Luc Besson. With Milla Jovovich, John Malkovich, Faye Dunaway. Production: Columbia Pictures.

+*The Passion of Joan of Arc* (1928, 114 min.). Director: Carl Theodore Dreyer. With Maria Falconetti, Eugene Sylvain. Production: Société Générale des Films.

Based on trial records, this film concentrates on Joan's trial and death; scenery details are copied from fifteenth-century manuscript miniatures.

+*Saint Joan* (1957, 110 min.). Director: Otto Preminger. With Jean Seberg, Richard Widmark, John Gielgud. Production: United Artists.

Based on George Bernard Shaw's play, the film follows Joan's life from Vaucouleurs to her death in Rouen.

+*The Servant* (1953). Director: Douglas Allen. With Pamela Alan, Peter Copley, Marjorie Manning. Production: British Broadcasting Corporation.

BBC Sunday Night Theatre, season 4, episode 26 (28 June 1953).

+*The Trial of Joan of Arc* [also known as *Le procès de Jeanne d'Arc*] (1962, 65 min.). Director: Robert Bresson. With Florence Delay, Jean-Claude Fourneau, Roger Honorat. Production: Agnès Delahaie Productions.

Joan's biography based on trial records.

LADY GODIVA: The following films are based on the legend of the Saxon woman who rides naked through the streets of Coventry to spare her lover and the town from her husband's wrath.

+*Lady Godiva* (1922). Director: Hubert Moest. With Hedda Vernon. Production: Wistaria Productions.

Based on Tennyson's poem.

+*Lady Godiva* [also known as *Lady Godiva of Coventry*] (1955, 89 min.). Director: Arthur Lubin. With Maureen O'Hara, George Nader, Victor McLaglen. Production: Universal International.

Lady Godiva's first meeting with Leofric and the events leading up to her mythic ride.

*The Last Legion** (2007, 102 min.). Director: Doug Leffler. With Colin Firth, Ben Kingsley, Aishwarya Rai. Production: Dino De Laurentiis Company.

Tells the events prior to the King Arthur storyline by focusing on Romulus Augustus during the fall of Rome; adds Mira, a female warrior.

The Lion in Winter (1968, 135 min.). Director: Anthony Harvey. With Katharine Hepburn, Peter O'Toole, Anthony Hopkins. Production: AVCO Embassy, Haworth Productions.

Eleanor of Aquitaine and her sons plotted against her husband's throne, a deed for which Henry imprisoned her; this film details their last visit.

The Lion in Winter (2003, 167 min.). Director: Andrey Konchalovsky. With Glenn Close, Patrick Stewart. Production: Flying Freehold Productions, Hallmark Entertainment.

Remake of the 1968 production.

Medieval Women (1987, 24 min.). Director: Society of Creative Anachronism. Production: University of Wisconsin-Green Bay Television Center.

*Mongol** [*Mongol: The Rise to Power of Genghis Khan*] (2007, 126 min.). Director: Sergei Bodrov. With Tadanobu Asano, Khulan Chuluun, Amadu Mamadakov. Production: Picturehouse.

Depicts a young Genghis Khan; the female role focuses on Temudgin's wife, Borte.

Mystic Women of the Middle Ages (2000, 24 min.). Production: Films for the Humanities & Sciences.

Six-part series focused on six medieval women and their spirituality. The episodes are "Visions of Prophecy," "Voices of Power," "Julian of Norwich," "St. Clare of Assisi," "Douceline de Digne," "Margery Kempe," and "Constance of Rabastens."

Mystic Women of the Middle Ages, Part 2 (2002, 49 min.). Production: Films for the Humanities & Sciences.

Four-part series focused on six women: Hildegard of Bingen, Hungarian Princesses Elizabeth and Margaret, Bridget of Sweden, Catherine of Siena, and Joan of Arc.

La passion de Beatrice [also known as *The Passion of Beatrice* and *Beatrice*] (1987, 128 min.). Director: Bertrand Tavernier. With Monique Chaumette, Julie Delpy, Bernard Pierre Donnadiou. Production: Cléa Productions.

Strong-willed woman's revenge on her father who forces her into an incestuous relationship long after he killed her mother for adultery; set during the Hundred Years War.

Passion of the Saints (50 min. episodes). Production: PBS/The Learning Channel.

Series includes "Joan of Arc" (volume 1); "Catherine of Siena" (volume 2); "Mary Magdalen: An Intimate Portrait" (volume 3).

POPE JOAN: Films focused on the legend of a female pope.

+*Pope Joan* [also released as *The Devil's Imposter*] (1972, 32 min.). Director: Michael Anderson. With Liv Ullmann, Olivia de Havilland, Lesley-Anne Down. Production: Big City Productions.

Set in the twentieth century, Joan is a preacher who, when regressed through hypnotism, finds that she is the woman who became pope in the ninth century.

+*Pope Joan* (2009, 149 min.). Director: Sönke Wortmann. With Johanna Wokalek, David Wenham, John Goodman. Production: Constantin Film.

Story of the possibility of a ninth-century female pope; in English and Latin.

*Princess of the Nile** (1954, 71 min.). Director: Harmon Jones. With Debra Paget, Jeffrey Hunter, Michael Rennie. Production: Panoramic Productions.

Set during the Crusades, the prince defeats an evil tyrant to regain his city and the hand of the princess.

*Quest of the Delta Knights** (1993, 97 min.). Director: James Dodson. With Olivia Hussey, David Warner. Production: Ramsway Ltd., Metro Pictures.

Evil queen and king wreak havoc for good knight.

The Red Mantle [also known as *Den røde kappe* and *Hagbard and Signe*] (1967, 100 min.). Director: Gabriel Axel. With Gitte Haenning, Eva Dahlbeck, Oleg Vidov, Gunnar Björnstrand. Production: ASA Film.

Based on the twelfth-century *Gesta Danorum*, describes the love of Hagbard for Signe and their deaths as part of a blood feud; set in Iceland.

La regina dei tartari [also known as *The Huns*, *The Queen of the Tartars*, and *La reine des barbares*] (1961, 102 min.). Director: Sergio Grieco. With Chelo Alonso, Jacques Sernas, Folco Lulli. Production: Film Columbus.

Two warring factions become allies when the queen of the Barlas falls in love with the Tartar leader.

The Return of Martin Guerre [also known as *Le retour de Martin Guerre*] (1982, 111 min.). Director: Daniel Vigne. With Nathalie Baye, Maurice Barrier. Production: SFPC, SPFMD, and FR3.

Based on sixteenth-century French sources, the story of a wife whose husband returns from war completely different from the man she had known.

Sommersby (1993, 114 min.). Director: Jon Amiel. With Richard Gere, Jodie Foster, Bill Pullman. Production: Alcor Films.

Retelling of the Martin Guerre story; set during the Civil War.

Saints or Sinners. Director: Society of Creative Anachronism. Production: University of Wisconsin-Green Bay Television Center.

The Seventh Seal [also known as *Det sjunde inseglet*]* (1956, 96 min.). Director: Ingmar Bergman. With Bibi Andersson, Max von Sydow, Bunnar Björnstrand, Bengt Ekerot. Production: Svensk Filmindustri.

Set in Sweden, a Crusader-knight returns home to find his country devastated by the plague; his chess game with Death includes a vision of a witch burning.

The Sorceress [also released as *Le moine et la sorcière*] (1988, 98 min.). Director: Suzanne Schiffman. Actors: Christine Boisson, Tchéky Karyo, Jean Carmet. Production: Bleu Productions.

Researched and written by medievalist Pamela Berger of Boston College, this story focuses on a female healer in medieval France who is a suspected witch. Based on Étienne de Bourbon's travel accounts.

Stealing Heaven (1988, 108 min.). Director: Clive Donner. With Kim Thompson, Derek de Lint, Denholm Elliott. Production: Voytek Roman, Amny International.

Based on Marion Mead's 1979 novel, this story focuses on the romance between twelfth-century lovers Héloïse and Abelard.

Strange Landscape.* Production: British Broadcasting Corporation
Television series narrated by Christopher Frayling describes life in medieval England. Also available in book form: *Strange Landscape: A Journey Through the Middle Ages* by Christopher Frayling (London: BBC Books, 1995). ISBN: 9780563369653.

Sword of the Conqueror [also known as *Rosmunda e Albino*]* (1962, 32 min.). Director: Carlo Campogalliani. With Jack Palance, Eleonora Rossi-Drago, Guy Madison. Production: Titanus, United Artists.

Set during a battle between the Lombards and the barbarians; Rosamunda falls in love with the leader of the barbarians.

Trollsyn [translates to *Second Sight*] (1994, 93 min.). Director: Ola Solum. With Julia Onsager Steen, Liv Bernhoft Osa, Bjørn Willberg Andersen, Reidar Sørensen. Production: Northern Lights A/S.

Set in plague-ridden Norway, details the life of the young girl Maren who is thought to have prophetic power.

Vikings (2013, 45 min.). Director: Varies. With Travis Fimmel, Katheryn Winnick. Production: Take 5 Productions.

Television series focused on the adventures of a Viking and his family.

The Viking Queen (1914). Director: Walter Edwin. With Mary Fuller, Harry Eyttinge. Production: Edison.

Details the story of a Norwegian queen, ruling in her own right, and her deposition by a rival whose tyranny defeats her and leads to Helga's return as queen.

Viking Women and the Sea Serpent (1957, 66 min.). Director: Roger Corman. With Susan Cabot, Abby Dalton. Production: Malibu Productions.

Group of women warriors search for missing menfolk, free them from captivity, and defeat a sea serpent who threatens their return home.

The Viking's Bride (1907). Director: Lewin Fitzhamon. Production: Hepworth.

Details the ritual of bride snatching.

The Viking's Daughter: The Story of the Ancient Norsemen (1908).

Director: J. Stuart Blackton. With Florence Lawrence. Production: Vitagraph.

Focuses on the love between a Viking's daughter and a Saxon prince, who saves her from a fire and marries her as his reward.

Viridiana (1961, 90 min.). Director: Luis Buñuel. With Silvia Pinal, Francisco Rabal, Fernando Rey. Production: Unión Industrial Cinematográfica.

Before she takes her final vows, a young novice is forced to visit her uncle who attempts to rape her and deceives her into believing she is no longer worthy of her religious vocation.

Les visiteurs du soir [also known as *The Devil's Envoy*s] (1942, 110 min.). Director: Marcel Carné. With Arletty, Marie Déa, Fernand Ledoux. Production: Productions André Paulvé.

Set in fifteenth-century France, this morality fable tells the story of a devil who sends two servants to interfere with the engagement party of a baron's daughter.

When Women Ruled: Great Women Leaders in World History (2006, 60 min.). Production: Films Media Group.

Educational video; includes Eleanor of Aquitaine and Joan of Arc.

B. WOMEN IN LITERATURE

L'annonce faite à Marie [also known as *The Annunciation of Marie*] (1991, 91 min.). Director: Alain Cuny. With Christelle Challab, Roberto Benavente, Ulrika Jonsson. Production: La Sept Cinéma, Desmond Productions.

Based on Paul Claudel's 1955 screenplay. Focuses on thwarted lovers who cannot marry because Violaine contracts leprosy; Violaine is seen as a healer who is called upon to bring her niece back to life.

ARTHURIAN LEGENDS: Various story lines in the following productions focus on female characters, including Guinevere, Morgan le Fay, Elaine, and Isolde. Also grouped together here are sixteen films on Isolde/Iseult.

+*The Adventures of Sir Lancelot** (1956-57, 30 min.). With Jane Hylton, William Russell. Production: Sapphire Films, Incorporated Television Company.

Television series.

+*Arthur of the Britons* (1972-73, 30 min.). Directors: Patrick Dromgoole, Sidney Hayers, and Peter Sasdy. With Oliver Tobias, Brian Blessed, Rupert Davies. Production: Sapphire Films.

Television series. Several episodes focus on women, including "Daughter of the King," "Rowena," and "The Marriage Feast."

+*Arthur's Quest* (1999, 87 min.). Director: Neil Mandt. With Eric Christian Olsen, Catherine Oxenberg, Alexandra Paul. Production: Crystal Sky Worldwide.

Family film. Merlin sends Arthur to the future, the present day, to escape Morgana; multiple female roles; loosely based on Mark Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*.

+ *Camelot* (1967, 178 min.). Director: Joshua Logan. With Vanessa Redgrave, Richard Harris. Production: Warner Brothers/Seven Arts. Musical.

+ *Camelot* (2011, 45 min.). Director: Varies. With Joseph Fiennes, Jamie Campbell Bower, Tamsin Egerton, Eva Green. Production: Starz Entertainment, GK Films.

Television series on Arthur's rise to the throne after Uther's death; expanded roles for Morgan and Igraine.

+ *Camelot: The Legend* (1998, 70 min.). Director: William R. Kowalchuk Jr. Production: Northway Productions.

Animated musical of the love story between Lancelot and Guinevere.

+ *A Knight in Camelot* (1998, 90 min.). Director: Roger Young. With Whoopi Goldberg, Michael York. Production: Norman Rosemont Productions, Walt Disney Television.

A scientific accident sends Dr. Vivien Morgan to King Arthur's court in this adaptation of Mark Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*.

+ *Excalibur* (1981, 140 min. [video 119 min.]). Director: John Boorman. With Helen Mirren, Nigel Terry, Nicol Williamson, Cherie Lunghi. Production: Orion Pictures.

Significant portrayals of Guinevere and Morgan le Fay.

+ *First Knight* (1995, 139 min.). Director: Jerry Zucker. With Julia Ormond, Sean Connery, Richard Gere. Production: Columbia Pictures.

Guinevere is a landowner near the Welsh borderlands who marries Arthur to protect her people.

+ *The Fisher King** (1991, 137 min.). Director: Terry Gilliam. With Amanda Plummer, Mercedes Ruehl, Robin Williams, Jeff Bridges. Production: Columbia Pictures.

A twentieth-century retelling of the tale focusing on the cracked American consciousness as a metaphor for the Wasteland.

+ *Guinevere* (1994, 96 min.). Director: Judson Taylor. With Sheryl Lee, Sean Patrick Flanery, Donald Pleasence, Noah Wyle. Production: Alexander/Enright & Associates, Hearst Entertainment.

Establishes Guinevere as a strong, educated fighter who forgoes her love of Lancelot to rule after her father's death.

+ *Guinevere Jones* (2002). Director: Arnie Custo. With Damien Bodie, Yani Gellman, Tamara Hope, Greta Larkins. Production: Crawfords Australia, Ibis Entertainment.

Television series featuring a teenager who is Queen Guinevere reincarnated; the show had two seasons.

ISOLDE AND TRISTAN: The love-triangle between Isolde, Tristan, and King Mark is the subject of many medieval tales. In these presentations, the lovers are often excused for their behavior because they unwittingly drink a magic potion that causes them to fall in love.

++ *Il cuore e la spada* [*Heart and Sword*] (1998, 198 min.). Director: Fabrizio Costa. With Ralf Bauer, Léa Bosco, Joachim Fuchsberger. Production: Sat. 1.

Based on Joseph Bedier's retelling of the legend, *The Romance of Tristan and Iseult*; in Portuguese.

++ *L'éternel retour* [also known as *The Eternal Return* and *Love Eternal*] (1943, 107 min.). Director: Jean Delannoy. Written by Jean Cocteau. With: Madeleine Sologne, Jean Marais, Jean Murat. Production: Film André Paulvé.

++ *Fire and Sword* [previously released in 1982 as *Feuer und Schwert*:

Die Legende von Tristan und Isolde (1985, 84 min.). Director: Veith von Fürstenberg. With Antonia Preser, Christoph Waltz, Peter Firth. Production: DNS, FFAT.

++*Isolde* (1989, 92 min.). Director: Jytte Rex. With Carsten Bang, Peter Boesen, Kirsten Brøndum. Production: Nordisk Film.

++*Tristan* (2003, 100 min.). Director: Philippe Harel. With Mathilde Seigner, Jean-Louis Loca, Sandrine Le Berre. Production: Canal +, ICE3.

A killer forces victims to read the classic Tristan and Isolde story; in French.

++*A Reading of Tristan & Isolde* (2009, 83 min.). Director: Scott Hillman. With Jennifer Betit Yen, Robert Smith. Production: Barman St Productions.

A comedy presenting a gender reversal of the protagonists.

++*Tristan and Iseult* [also known as *Tristan et Yseult*] (1920). Director: Maurice Mariaud. With Sylvio de Pedrelli, Albert Bras, Tania Daleyme, Frank Heurs. Production: Films Louis Nalpas.

++*Tristano e Isolda* [also known as *Tristan and Isolda*] (1911). Director: Ugo Falena. With Francesca Bertini, Bianca Lorenzoni, Serafino Mastracchio. Production: Film d'Arte italiana.

++*Tristan et Iseult* (1972, 60 min.). Director: Yvan LaGrange. With Claire Wauthion, Yvan Lagrange. Production: Film du Soir.

++*Tristan et Iseut* (2002, 83 min.). Director: Thierry Schiel. Voices of Louis Wright, Ciara Barker. Production: Neuroplanet, Oniria Pictures.

Animated retelling; in French. A German television version of the film runs 77 minutes.

++ *Tristan and Isolde* [also released as *Lovespell*] (1979, 91 min.). Director: Tom Donovan. With Kate Mulgrew, Richard Burton, Nicholas Clay. Production: Clar Films.

++ *Tristan + Isolde* [*Tristan & Isolde*] (2006, 125 min.). Director: Kevin Reynolds. With James Franco, Sophia Myles, Rufus Sewell. Production: Twentieth Century Fox.

Focuses on the Mark-Isolde-Tristan love triangle; the second Isolde has been removed.

++ *Tristan und Isolde* (1999, 238 min.). Director: Brian Large. With Jane Eaglen, Ben Heppner. Conducted by James Levine. Production: Metropolitan Opera, Universal Pictures Home Video.

Performance of Wagner's opera; in German.

++ *Tristan und Isolde* (2008, 358 min.). Director: Nikolaus Lehnhoff. With Robert Gambill, Nina Stemme. Conducted by Jiří Bělohávek. Production: Glyndebourne Festival Opera.

Performance of Wagner's opera; in German.

++ *Tristan und Isolde* (2009, 289 min.). Director: Michael Beyer. With Robert Dean Smith, Irène Theorin, Robert Holl, Michelle Breedt. Conducted by Peter Schneider. Production: Festspiele Bayreuth.

Performance of Wagner's opera; in German.

++ *Tristan und Isolde* (2007, 80 min.). Director: Patrizia Carmine. With Ian Storey, Waltraud Meier. Production: RaiTrade, Teatro alla Scala de Milano.

Television movie of Wagner's opera; in German.

++ *Tristan und Isolde* (2010, 81 min.). Directors: Stephanie Vlahos and Chris M. Allport. With Jeffrey Springer, Othalie Graham. Production: Allport Production Studios.

Condensed version of Wagner's opera; in German.

+*King Arthur* (2004, 126 min.). Director: Antoine Fuqua. With Clive Owen, Ioan Gruffudd, Keira Knightley. Production: Touchstone Pictures.

Presents Guinevere as a Woad princess who fights the Saxons to protect Britain; director's cut has 16 additional minutes.

+*Kids of the Round Table** (1995, 89 min.). Director: Robert Tinnell. With Johnny Morina, Malcolm McDowell, Maggie Castle. Production: Melenny Productions.

Arthurian story set in the present day with an appearance from Merlin. Alex must overcome bullying and deal with his emotions when the girl he likes, Jenny, prefers Luke.

+*Knights of the Round Table** (1953, 115 min.). Director: Richard Thorpe. With Ava Gardner, Robert Taylor, Mel Ferrer. Production: Metro-Goldman-Mayer.

+*Lady of Shalot* (1912). Director: Elwin Neame. With Ivy Close. Production: Ivy Close Films.

Based on Tennyson's nineteenth-century poem.

+*Lady of Shalot* (1915). Director: C. J. Williams. With Flora Finch. Production: Vitagraph.

Based on Tennyson's nineteenth-century poem.

+*Lady of the Lake* (1912). Director: J. Stuart Blackton. With Edith Storey, Ralph Ince, Harry T. Morey. Production: Vitagraph.

+*Lady of the Lake* (1930). Director: James A. Fitzpatrick. With Percy Marmont, Benita Hume, Lawson Butt. Production: Fitzpatrick Pictures.

+*La donna del lago* [*The Lady of the Lake*; US title *The Possessed*] (1965, 95 min.). Directors: Luigi Bazzoni and Franco Rossellini. With Valentina Cortese, Peter Baldwin, Salvo Randone. Production: B. R. C. Produzione.

+*Lancelot and Elaine* [also known as *Launcelot and Elaine*] (1909). Director: Charles Kent. With Florence Turner, Charles Kent, Paul Panzer. Production: Vitagraph.

Based on Tennyson's *Idylls of the King*.

+*Lancelot du Lac* (1974, 85 min.). Director: Robert Bresson. With Laura Duke Condominas, Luc Simon. Production: Mara Films, Laser Production, Office de Radiodiffusion Télévision Française.

Based on the *Mort Artu*, details the developing relationship between Guinevere and Lancelot.

+*The Legend of King Arthur** (1979, 30 min.). With Felicity Dean, Andrew Burt, Maureen O'Brien. Production: Time-Life Television and the Australian Broadcasting Commission for the British Broadcasting Corporation.

Television series.

+*Merlin** [*Merlin: The Magic Begins*, *Merlin: The Quest Begins*] (1998, 89 min.). Director: David Winning. With Jason Connery, Deborah Moore, Gareth Thomas.

Made for television movie; presents a story of a young Merlin; female characters include Nimue, Morgana, and Princess Leona.

+*Merlin* (1998, 182 min.). Director: Steve Barron. With Sam Neill, Helena Bonham Carter, Miranda Richardson, Isabella Rossellini. Production: Hallmark Entertainment.

Made-for-television retelling from Merlin's perspective; features Morgan le Fey, Nimue, and Queen Mab.

+*Merlin's Apprentice* (2006, 176 min.). Director: David Wu. With Sam Neill, Miranda Richardson, John Reardon, Meghan Ory. Production: Hallmark Entertainment.

Made-for-television sequel to *Merlin*. Set after the fall of Arthur's kingdom with Merlin attempting to protect Camelot after the

Holy Grail has been stolen; also contains a subplot involving Briana, a young woman wanting to become a knight.

+*Merlin* (2008-12, 45 min.). Director: Varies. With Colin Morgan, Bradley James, Angel Coulby, Katie McGrath. Production: Shine Limited, BBC Wales.

Television series focusing on the adventures of a young Merlin and Arthur; significant roles for Gwen and Morgana.

+*Merlin and the Book of Beasts* (2009, 93 min.). Director: Warren P. Sonoda. With James Callis, Laura Harris. Production: The Sci-Fi Channel, Front Street Pictures.

Fantasy film set after Arthur dies and his daughter has to protect Camelot from an evil sorcerer.

+*Merlin* [*Merlin; L'enchangeur désenchanté*] (2011). Director: Stéphane Kappes. With Gérard Jugnot, Marilou Berry, Joséphine de Meaux, Olivier Broche, Christiana Capotondi. Production: GMT Productions, TFI, Okko Productions.

Two part French television film; roles for Morgane, Guenièvre, Camelia, and Vivaine.

+*Monty Python and the Holy Grail** (1974, 90 min.). Director: Terry Gilliam. With Terry Jones, John Cleese, Terry Gilliam, Michael Palin. Production: Michael White Productions, National Film Trustee Company, Python Pictures.

Quest satire, with depictions of lecherous virgins and gendered role reversals.

+*The Morte d'Arthur** (1984, 240 min.). Director: Gillian Lynne. With John Barton, Jeremy Brett. Production: British Broadcasting Corporation.

Imprisoned knight narrates the last two books of the *Morte*.

+ *The Mists of Avalon* (2001, 183 min.). Director: Uli Edel. With Anjelica Huston, Julianna Margulies, Joan Allen, Samantha Mathis. Production: Constantin Film Produktion, Turner Network Television.

Television miniseries adaptation of *The Mists of Avalon* by Marion Zimmer Bradley; focuses on each of the women associated with King Arthur.

+ *Prince Valiant* (1997, 92 min.). Director: Anthony Hickox. With Stephen Moyer, Katherine Heigl, Edward Fox, Joanna Lumley. Production: Babelsberg Film, Constantin Film Produktion.

A young man claiming to be Sir Gawain pines for the princess Ilene; Morgan Le Fay plays the villain.

+ *Siege of the Saxons* (1963, 85 min.). Director: Nathan Juran. With Janette Scott, Ronald Lewis, Ronald Howard. Production: Columbia Pictures.

Katherine, Arthur's daughter, avenges his death and protects her kingdom.

+ *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (1973, 93 min.). Director: Stephen Weeks. With Murray Head, Ciaren Madden, Nigel Green, Robert Hardy. Production: Scancrest.

Morgan le Fay and Lady Bertilak test the greatest knight of Arthur's court.

+ *The Sword of Lancelot* [also released in Britain as *Lancelot and Guinevere*] (1963, 116 min.). Director: Cornel Wilde. With Cornel Wilde, Jean Wallace, Brian Aherne. Production: Emblem Productions.

Love affair with Guinevere from Lancelot's point of view.

+ *The Sword of the Valiant* (1984, 162 min.). Director: Stephen Weeks. With Lila Kedrova, Miles O'Keefe, Sean Connery. Production: Golan-Globus Productions.

Based on the medieval poem *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.

+*Quest for Camelot* (1998, 85 min.). Director: Frederik Du Chau. Voices of Jessalyn Gilsig, Cary Elwes, Gary Oldman. Production: Warner Bros.

A young, strong-willed woman embarks on a quest to save Excalibur from the evil Ruber; animated; based on Vera Chapman's novel *The King's Damsel*.

AUCASSIN AND NICOLETTE: These two films are based on the twelfth-century romance chant-fable in which a young French nobleman cannot marry his beloved because she is Muslim. Gender roles are reversed and Nicolette brings about the happy resolution of this tale.

+*Aucassin and Nicolette* (1975, 16 min.). Director: Lotte Reiniger. Production: National Film Board of Canada.

Based on the medieval chant-fable in which gender roles are critiqued; animated.

+*In the Days of Chivalry* [also known as *Aucassin and Nicolette*] (1911). Director: J. Searle Dawley. With Marc MacDermott, Mabel Trunnelle, Mary Fuller. Production: Edison.

BEOWULF: Many recent films include female characters, expand the roles of women, or create new female characters.

+*Beowulf* (1999, 95 min.). Director: Graham Baker. With Christopher Lambert, Rhona Mitra, Oliver Cotton, Layla Roberts. Production: Kushner-Locke Company, Capitol Films.

Futuristic, science fiction adaptation; adds the character Kyra, Hrothgar's daughter.

+*Beowulf and Grendel* (2005, 103 min.). Director: Sturla Gunnarsson. With Gerard Butler, Ingvar Eggert Sigurðsson, Steinunn

Ólína Þorsteinsdóttir, Sarah Polley. Production: Movision, Beowulf Productions.

Depicts a relationship between Beowulf and the witch Selma.

+*Beowulf: Prince of the Geats** (2007). Director: Scott Wegener. With Joe Thomas, Burt McCollom, Eric Feliciano, Lisa Baldwin. Production: David Garrison Productions.

Retells the story of Beowulf.

+*Beowulf* (2007, 114 min.). Director: Robert Zemeckis. With Ray Winstone, Robin Wright Penn, Anthony Hopkins, Angelina Jolie. Production: Paramount Pictures.

Computer-generated film retelling. Grendel's mother seduces men and causes their downfall; alludes to a brief Beowulf, Hrothgar, Wealhtheow love triangle before adapting the plot so that Wealhtheow becomes Beowulf's wife; also introduces the concubine Ursula.

The Black Shield of Falworth (1954, 99 min.). Director: Rudolph Maté. With Janet Leigh, Tony Curtis. Production: Universal International Pictures.

Depiction of courtly love in medieval England based on Howard Pyle's novel *Men of Iron* (1919).

Blanche (1971, 92 min.). Director: Walerian Borowczyk. With Ligia Branice, Jacques Perrin. Production: Abel et Charton, Télépress Films.

Based on Juliusz Slowacki's nineteenth-century drama *Mazepa*.

THE CANTERBURY TALES: Few films of the tales include them all, but most depict the Wife of Bath.

+*The Canterbury Tales* (1971, 109 min.). Director: Pier Paolo Pasolini. With Laura Betti, Josephine Chaplin, Ninetto Davoli. Production:

Les Productions Artistes Associés, Produzioni Europee Associati.

Selected tales including “The Wife of Bath’s Tale” and “The Merchant’s Tale” as told by medieval travelers.

+*The Canterbury Tales** (1998–2000, 28 min.). Director: Varies. With Robert Lindsay, Billie Whitelaw, Imelda Staunton. Production: Christmas Films.

Television series; two formal episodes that encompass multiple tales. The first, “Leaving London” includes a version of “The Knight’s Tale,” “The Wife of Bath’s Tale,” and “The Nun’s Priest’s Tale.” The second episode, “Arriving at Canterbury” adapts “The Franklin’s Tale,” “The Merchant’s Tale,” and “The Pardoner’s Tale.”

+*The Canterbury Tales** (2003, 349 min.). Director: Varies. With Nikki Amuka-Bird, James Nesbitt, Chiwetel Ejiofor, Billie Piper. Production: Ziji Productions, British Broadcasting Corporation.

Television series retelling, modernizing, and combining the tales; six episodes: “The Miller’s Tale,” “The Wife of Bath’s Tale,” “The Knight’s Tale,” “The Sea Captain’s Tale,” “The Pardoner’s Tale,” and “The Man of Law’s Tale.”

*The Court Jester** (1956, 101 min.). Directors: Melvin Frank and Norman Panama. With Glynis Johns, Danny Kaye, Basil Rathbone, Angela Lansbury. Production: Dena Enterprises.

Woman pursued by phony jester in medieval English court.

THE DECAMERON: The following four films are based on Boccaccio’s famous tales, which include images of women as medieval archetypes.

+*The Decameron* (1971, 111 min.). Director: Pier Paolo Pasolini. With Angela Luce, Ninetto Davoli, Franco Citti. Production: Produzione Europee Associati.

+*Decameron Nights* (1953, 75 min.). Director: Hugo Fregonese. With Joan Fontaine, Joan Collins, Louis Jourdan. Production: Cesáreo González Producciones Cinematográficas.

Decameron N. 3: L'ultimo Decameron: Le più belle donne del Boccaccio [*The Last Decameron: Adultery in 7 Easy Lessons*] (1972, 103 min.). Director: Italo Alfaro.

With Pier Paola Bucchi, Giovanni Elsner. Production: Victor Cinematografica.

Novelle galeotte d'amore (1972, 94 min.). Director Antonio Margheriti (aka Anthony Dawson). With Aldo Bufi Landi, Ada Pometti, Antonio Cantafora. Production: Seven Film Productions.

+*Virgin Territory** (2007, 97 min.). Director: David Leland. With Hayden Christensen, Mischa Barton. Production: Dino De Laurentiis Cinematografica.

DON QUIXOTE: For the love of Dulcinea, Spanish knight errant pursues fame and honor in the following presentations.

+*Don Quixote** (1933, 82 min.). Director: Georg Wilhelm Pabst. With Foedor Chaliapin, George Robey, Sidney Fox. Production: Nelson Film, Vandor Film.

+*Don Quixote de la Mancha** (1949, 137 min.). Director: Rafael Gil. With Rafael Rivelles, Juan Calvo, Sara Montiel. Production: Compañía Industrial Film Español S. A.

+*Don Quixote** [*Don Kikbot*] (1957, 110 min.). Director: Grigori Kozintsev. With Nikolai Cherkasov, Yuri Tolubeyev, Serafima Birman. Production: Lenfilm Studio.

+*Don Quixote** (1973). Director: Alvin Rakoff. With Rex Harrison, Frank Finlay. Production: Universal Studios, British Broadcasting Corporation.

+*Don Quixote** (1973, 111 min.). Directors: Robert Helpmann and Rudolf Nureyev. With Robert Helpmann, Ray Powell, Lucette Aldous, Rudolf Nureyev. Production: International Arts.

Original choreography by Marious Petipa to music by Ludwig Minkun in 1869 for the Kirov Ballet; subsequently revised for later productions.

+*Don Quixote** (2000, 120 min.). Director: Peter Yates. With John Lithgow, Bob Hoskins, Isabella Rossellini, Vanessa Williams. Production: Hallmark Entertainment.

+*Don Quijote de la Mancha* [*El Quijote de Miguel de Cervantes*] (1991-92, 310 min.). Director: Manuel Gutiérrez Aragón. With Fernando Ray, Alfredo Landa. Production: Televisión Española.

Five-part Spanish television miniseries about the first half of the Cervantes novel.

*Don Quixote, Knight Errant** [*El caballero Don Quijote*] (2002, 122 min.). Director: Manuel Gutiérrez Aragón. With Juan Luis Galiardo, Kiti Mánver, María Isasi. Production: Canal+ España.

Spanish sequel to *El Quijote de Miguel de Cervantis* (1991); focuses on the second half of Cervantes's novel.

+*Man of La Mancha** (1972, 130 min.). Director: Arthur Hiller. With Sophia Loren, Peter O'Toole, James Coco. Production: Produzioni Europee Associati.

Musical.

The Fair Maid of Perth (1923). Director: Edwin Greenwood. With Sylvia Caine, Lionel D'Aragon. Production: Anglia Films.

Based on Sir Walter Scott's nineteenth-century novel *St. Valentine's Day; or, The Fair Maid of Perth*.

FAUST: The following adaptations of Goethe's tragedy recount the story of a man who sells his soul to win the woman he loves, Marguerite.

+Faust* (1910) Directors: Henri Andréani and David Barnett. With Alfredo Bracci, Fernanda Negri Pouget. Production: Pathé Frères.

+*Faust** (1960, 128 min.). Directors: Peter Gorski and Gustaf Gründgens. With Ella Büchi, Elisabeth Flickenschildt. Production: Divina-Film.

+*Faust et Marguerite** (1897). Director: Georges Méliès. Production: Star.

+*Faust and Marguerite** (1900). Director: Edwin S. Porter. Production: Edison.

+*Faust et Marguerite** (1904). Director: Georges Méliès. With Georges Méliès. Production: Star.

+*Faust and the Devil** [also known as *La leggenda di Faust*] (1948, 87 min.). Director: Carmine Gallone. With Italo Tajo, Nelly Corradi. Production: Cineopera.

+*Faust aux enfers** (1903). Director: Georges Méliès. With Georges Méliès. Production: Star.

La Favorita (1952, 88 min.). Director: Cesare Barlacchi. With Sophia Loren, Franca Tamantini, Paolo Silveri. Production: M. A. S. Film.

Based on Gaetano Donizetti's nineteenth-century opera in which a commoner wins the hand of a noblewoman whom he rejects.

FRANCESCA DE RIMINI: These productions focus on the love story adapted from Dante.

Francesca de Rimini, or The Two Brothers (1910). Director: William V. Ranous. With Florence Turner. Production: Vitagraph.

Based on George Henry Boker's nineteenth-century tragedy of the same name, the story draws on Dante's account of adulterous lovers who are killed by Francesca's husband.

Francesca da Rimini (2004, 137 min.). Director: Michelangelo Rossi. With Daniela Dessi, Fabio Armiliato, Giacinta Nicotra. Production: Sfersterio Opera Festival, RaiTrade.

Performance of Riccardo Zandonai's opera; in Italian.

GENEVIÈVE DE BRABANT: Based on the medieval legend, which has been the subject of several literary works, the following films detail the story of a faithful wife who protects herself and her family despite being thrown out of their home.

+*Geneviève de Brabant* (1907). Producer: Pathé Frères.

+*Genoveffa* [also known as *Genevieve*] (1932). Director: Giulio Amauli. With Dina Lanza. Production: Italian-American Photofilm Company.

+*Genoveva de Brabante* (1965). Director: José Luis Monter. With Maria José Alfonso, Franco Balducci, Andrea Bosic. Production: Imprecine and Hispamer Films.

+*La leggenda di Genoveffa* [also known as *The Legend of Genoveffa* and *The Mistress of Treves*] (1951). Director: Arthur Maria Rabenalt. With Anne Vernon, Rossano Brazzi, Emilio Baldanello. Production: Produzione Venturini.

Griséldis (1912). With Berthe Bovy, Production: Pathé Frères.

Based on the story told by Chaucer, Boccaccio, and Petrarch.

THE HUNCHBACK OF NOTRE DAME: The following films depict Victor Hugo's nineteenth-century representation of a medieval gypsy in Paris.

+ *The Darling of Paris* (1917). Director: J. Gordon Edwards. With Theda Bara, Alice Gale, Glen White. Production: Fox Film.

+ *La Esmeralda* (1905). Director: Alice Guy Blaché. With Denise Baker, Henri Vorins. Production: Gaumont.

+ *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* (1923, 108 min.). Director: Wallace Worsley. With Patsy Ruth Miller, Lon Chaney, Production: Universal Pictures.

+ *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* (1939, 117 min.). Director: William Dieterle. With Maureen O'Hara, Charles Laughton. Production: RKO Radio Pictures.

+ *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* [also known as *Notre Dame de Paris*] (1956, 115 min.). Director: Jean Delannoy. With Gina Lollobrigida, Anthony Quinn. Production: Paris Film Productions.

+ *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* [also released as *The Hunchback*] (1982, 150 min.). Director: Michael Tuchner. With Lesley-Anne Down, Anthony Hopkins, John Gielgud, Derek Jacobi. Production: Norman Rosemont Productions/Columbia Pictures Television.

+ *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* (1996, 90 min.). Director: Gary Trousdale. Voices of Mary Kay Bergman, Jason Alexander, Kevin Kline. Production: Walt Disney Pictures.

Animated.

+*The Hunchback* [*The Hunchback of Notre Dame*] (1997, 98 min.). Director: Peter Medak. With Mandy Patinkin, Richard Harris, Salma Hayek. Production: Adelson-Baumgarten Productions.

+*Notre Dame de Paris* (1911, 36 min.). Director: Albert Capellani. With Stacia Napierkowska, Henry Krauss. Production: Pathé Frères.

+*Notre-Dame de Paris* (1999, 150 min.). Director: Gilles Amado. With Héléne Ségara, Daniel Lavoie, Bruno Pelletier, Garou. Production: Pomme Musique.

Televised performance of the French musical based on Victor Hugo's novel; in French.

+*Notre-Dame de Paris* (2002, 130 min.). Director: Gilles Maheu. With Lola Ponce, Giò Di Tonno, Vittorio Matteucci, Matteo Setti. Production: Enzo Entertainment.

Italian version of the French musical based on Victor Hugo's novel; in Italian.

+*Vox Lumiere: The Hunchback of Notre Dame* (2008, 97 min.). Director: Michael King. With Victoria Levy, Greg Whipple. Production: 18111.

Silent film and rock music combined for a retelling of Victor Hugo's novel.

IVANHOE: Rebecca, a Jew, and Ivanhoe, a Christian, agonize over their forbidden love in the following ten films based on Sir Walter Scott's depiction of twelfth-century chivalry and knighthood.

+*Ivanhoe* (1913). Director: Herbert Brenon. With Leah Baird, King Baggot. Production: Independent Moving Pictures.

+*Ivanhoe* (1952, 106 min.). Director: Richard Thorpe. With Elizabeth Taylor, Joan Fontaine, Robert Taylor. Production: Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

+*Ivanhoe** (1958-59, 30 min.). With Roger Moore, Robert Brown.
Production: Screen Gems Television.

Television series; 39 episodes.

+*Ivanhoe* (1982, 180 min.). Director: Douglas Camfield. With James Mason, Olivia Hussey, Anthony Andrews. Production: Columbia Pictures Television.

+*Ivanhoe** (1997, 270 min.). Director: Stuart Orme. With Steven Waddington, Susan Lynch, Victoria Swift, Ciarán Hinds. Production: A&E Television Network, British Broadcasting Corporation.

Television miniseries; six episodes.

+*Ivanhoe** [*The Legend of Ivanhoe*] (1999, 92 min.). With John Haver-son, Rita Shaver, Clifton Brady, Sarah Parker. Production: Columbia TriStar International Television.

+*Rebecca the Jewess* [also known as *Ivanhoe*] (1913). Director: Leedham Bantock. With Nancy Bevington, Ethel Bracewell, Lauderdale Maitland. Production: Zenith Film.

+*Young Ivanhoe* (1995, 96 min.). Director: Ralph L. Thomas. With Margot Kidder, Stacy Keach, Kristen Holden-Ried. Production: Filmline International Productions

A prequel to the typical Ivanhoe storyline.

*Young Ivanhoe** (1999, 93 min.). Director: Ralph L. Thomas. With Stacey Keach, Margot Kidder, Kris Holden-Ried, Rachel Blanchard. Production: Filmline International, Hallmark Entertainment.

Television movie version.

*A Knight's Tale** (2001, 132 min.). Director: Brian Helgeland. With Heath Ledger, Rufus Sewell, Shannyn Sossamon. Production: Columbia Pictures.

Thatcher's son becomes a knight. Includes theme of courtly love and discussion of respect for women and women's work; extended edition includes 12 additional minutes.

Kristin Lavransdatter (1995, 180 min.). Director: Liv Ullmann. With Elisabeth Matheson. Production: Norsk Film.

Young woman insists she be placed in a convent to await her impending marriage after an attempted rape but there meets a knight with whom she escapes; based on the book by Sigrid Undset.

Layla [also known as *Mágnún and Layla* and *Mágnún et Layla*] (1989, 90 min.). Director: Taieb Louhichi. With Sid Ahmed Agoumi, Anca Nicola. Production: Tanit Productions.

Based on André Miquel's novel, *Layla, ma raison*, which details the story of thwarted seventh-century Persian lovers.

LOCHINVAR: Based on Sir Walter Scott's poem, the following films recount the unhappy marriage of Ellen (or Helen) and her rescue by her lover, Lochinvar; set in fifteenth-century Scotland.

+*Lochinvar* (1909). Director: J. Searle Dawley. With Marc McDermott, Mary Fuller. Production: Edison.

+*Lochinvar* (1915). Director: Lesie Seldon-Truss. With Peggy Hyland, Godfrey Tearle. Production: Gaumont.

+*Young Lochinvar* (1911). With William Russell, Marguerite Snow. Production: Thanouser Film.

+*Young Lochinvar* (1923). Director: Will Kelino. With Gladys Jennings, Dorothy Harris, Owen Nares. Production: Stoll Picture Productions.

The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring [*The Fellowship of the Ring*] (2001, 178 min.). Director: Peter Jackson. With Viggo Mortensen, Ian McKellen, Elijah Wood, Cate Blanchett, Liv Tyler. Production: New Line Cinema.

First of three films based on J. R. R. Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* trilogy; roles of Galadriel and Arwen expanded; themes of love and duty considered; two extended editions: one totaling 208 minutes and a blu ray edition running 228 minutes.

The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers [*The Two Towers*] (2002, 179 min.). Director: Peter Jackson. With Viggo Mortensen, Miranda Otto, Liv Tyler, Elijah Wood. Production: New Line Cinema.

Second of three films based on Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* trilogy; significant focus on Eowyn and Arwen; themes of love and duty considered; two extended editions: one running 223 minutes and another running 235 minutes.

The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King [*The Return of the King*] (2003, 201 min.). Director: Peter Jackson. With Viggo Mortensen, Miranda Otto, Liv Tyler, Elijah Wood. Production: New Line Cinema.

Third of three films based on Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* trilogy; multiple themes including queenship, obedience, and the woman warrior; two extended editions: one totaling 251 minutes and a blu ray edition running 263 minutes.

Lusty Wives of Canterbury [also known as *I racconti di Canterbury*] (1972). Director: Lucio Dandolo. With Claudia Bianchi, Riki Marie Odile. Production: Cinecenta.

Prostitutes tell six stories of racy adventures.

Mariken (2000, 92 min.). Director: André van Duren. With Laurien Van den Broeck, Jan Decler, Kim van Kooten. Production: Egmond Film & Television.

Dutch legend about an orphan raised by a hermit who begins a quest to find her mother; in Dutch.

Mariken van Nieumeghan [also known as *Mariken*] (1974, 80 min.). Director: Jos Stelling. With Ronnie Montagne, Alida Sonnega, Sander Bais, Production: Jos Stelling Film.

Based on the Dutch miracle play of the same name, the story focuses on Mariken and her companion Moenen, who are blamed for the arrival of the plague; Mariken subsequently saves herself from execution by disguising herself as a plague victim.

The Middle Ages: A Wanderer's Guide to Life and Letters (1971, 27 min.). Director: Piers Jessup. Production: Learning Corporation of America; John H. Secondari Productions.

Depictions of medieval women in everyday life from period literature.

DIE NIBELUNGEN: Based on the thirteenth-century Middle High German epic story, these films focus on the revenge feuds led by Brunhild and Kriemhild.

The Curse of the Ring [*Dark Kingdom: The Dragon King, Kingdom in Twilight, Die Nibelungen: Der Fluch des Drachen, Ring of the Nibelungs, Sword of Xantan*] (2004, 180 min.). Director: Uli Edel. With Benno Fürmann, Kristanna Loken, Alicia Witt, Julian Sands. Production: Tandem Communications.

Television miniseries; retells the story of Siegfried, including his relationship with Brunhild.

+*Die Nibelungen* [also known as *Kriembilds Rache, Kriembild's Revenge, The Nibelungs, and Siegfried*] (1925, 186 min.). Director: Fritz Lang. With Margarete Schön, Paul Richter, Hanna Ralph. Production: UFA.

In *Siegfried* (part one), title hero seeks immortality by slaying the

dragon. In part two, titled *Kriembild's Revenge*, Siegfried's wife plots revenge for the death of her husband and marries Attila the Hun as part of her plan.

+*Die Nibelungen* [also known as *Whom the Gods Wish to Destroy*] (1966, 85 min.). Director: Harald Reinl. With Uwe Beyer, Karin Dor, Maria Marlow. Production: Avala Film; Central Cinema Company.

+*Attila* [*I Nibelunghi*] (1910). Director: M. Bernacchi. Production: Milano Films.

Die Nibelungen (2002, 180 min.). Director: Dieter Wedel. With Mario Adorf, Götz Schubert, Judith Rosmair, Maria Schrader.

A film of the Moritz Rinke play performed at the Nibelungen-Festspiele, Worms; in German.

DER RING DES NIBELUNGEN: Richard Wagner's four-part interpretation of *Die Nibelungen* composed of *Das Rheingold*, *Die Walkure*, *Siegfried*, and *Gotterdammerung* has been set in various chronological and social contexts in numerous productions.

Der Ring des Nibelungen (2005, 832m) Director: Patrice Chéreau. With Gwyneth Jones, Donald McIntyre, Peter Hofmann, Jeanine Almeyar. Conductor: Pierre Boulez. Bayreuth Festival Orchestra and Chorus.

Der Ring des Nibelungen (2012, 920 min. + 77 min. extras). Director: Robert Lepage. With Bryn Terfel, Deborah Voigt, Jay Hunter Morris, Stephanie Blythe. Conductors: James Levine and Fabio Luisi. Metropolitan Opera Orchestra and Chorus.

Der Ring des Nibelungen (2007, 917m) Director: Harry Kupfer. With John Tomlinson, Anne Evans, Siegfried Jerusalem, Waltraud Meier, Conductor: Daniel Barenboim. Bayreuth Festival Orchestra and Chorus

*Orlando Furioso** (1974, 113 min.). Director: Luca Ronconi. With Edmonda Aldini, Massimo Foschi, Peter Chatel. Production: Radio-televisione Italiana.

Miniseries based on Ludovico Aristo's poem; focuses on the madness and regeneration of the hero.

PIA DE' TOLOMEI: The following five films recount the murder of a noblewoman on the charge of adultery.

+*Pia de' Tolomei* (1908). Director: Mario Caserini. Production: Cines.

+*Pia de' Tolomei* (1910, 10 min.). Director: Gerolamo Lo Savio. With Francesca Bertini, Francesco Di Gennaro. Production: Film d'Arte Italiana, Pathé Frères.

+*Pia de' Tolomei* (1922). Director: Giovanni Zannini. With Lina Pellegrini, Vittorio Simbolotti. Production: Zannini Film.

+*Pia de' Tolomei* (1941, 78 min.). Director: Esodo Pratelli. With Germana Paolieri, Carlo Tamberlani, Nino Crisman. Production: Manderfilm.

+*Pia de Tolomei* (2005, 137 min.). Director: Christian Gangneron. With Daniel Borowski, Carlo Cigni, Patrizia Ciofi. Conductor: Paolo Arrivabeni. Teatro La Fenice Orchestra and Chorus. Production: Dynamic S.r.l.

Performance of Gaetano Donizetti's opera; in Italian.

The Purification (1977, 29 min.). Production: Media Centre, University of Toronto.

Reenactment of the York Cycle Pageant medieval mystery play in which Mary seeks purification at the Temple.

ROBIN HOOD: Although Maid Marian was not part of the original poem, her role as Robin's love interest has parallels in medieval romance and fairy tales.

+*Back to Sherwood* (1999, 25 min.). Directors: Roger Cantin and Rodney Gibbons. With Aimée Castle, Alexa Dubreuil, Larry Day. Production: Prisma Productions Inc., Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Television series focusing on a teenage descendent of Robin Hood; sex of several characters changed, including a female Robyn Hood and Joan Little; thirteen episodes.

+*The Adventures of Robin Hood** (1938, 106 min.). Directors: Michael Curtiz and William Keighley. With Olivia de Havilland, Errol Flynn, Basil Rathbone. Production: Warner Brothers.

+*The Adventures of Robin Hood** (1955-60, 30 min.). Director: Bernard Knowles. With Bernadette O'Farrell, Patricia Driscoll, Richard Greene. Production: Incorporated Television, Sapphire Films, Yeoman Films.

Television series.

+*The Bandit of Sherwood Forest** (1947, 86 min.). Directors: Henry Levin and George Sherman. With Anita Louise, Cornel Wilde. Production: Columbia Pictures.

+*A Challenge for Robin Hood** (1967, 85 min.). Director: C. M. Pennington-Richards. With Gay Hamilton, Barrie Ingham, James Hayter. Hammer Film Productions.

+*Maid Marian and Her Merry Men* (1989-94, 25 min.). Director: David Bell. With Kate Lonergan, Wayne Morris. Production: British Broadcasting Corporation.

Television series that depicts Marian as the real leader of the band and Robin as a cowardly tailor.

+*Men of Sherwood Forest** (1954, 77 min.). Director: Val Guest. With Reginald Beckwith, Don Taylor. Production: Hammer Film Productions.

+*New Adventures of Robin and Marian* (1997–99, 50 min.). Director: Varies. With Barbara Griffin, Matthew Porretta, Anna Galvin. Production: Baltic Ventures International, TNT, Warner Bros. International Television.

Television series featuring “Marian to the Rescue,” “Witches of the Abbey,” “The Legend of the Amazons,” and “The Devil’s Bride.”

+*Princess of Thieves* (2001, 88 min.). Director: Peter Hewitt. With Keira Knightly, Malcolm McDowell. Production: Granada Entertainment.

The adventures of Robin Hood’s teenage daughter.

+*Robin and Marian* (1976, 112 min.). Director: Richard Lester. With Audrey Hepburn, Sean Connery. Production: Columbia Pictures.

Set years after their first meeting, Marian, a nun, and Robin, an aging outlaw, meet again and eventually commit suicide, asking to be buried together.

+*Robin Hood** (1912, 30 min.). Director: Étienne Arnaud. With Robert Frazer, Barbara Tennant, Mathilde Baring, John G. Adolphi. Production: Éclair American.

+*Robin Hood** (1913). Director: Theodore Marston. With Gerda Holmes, William Russell. Production: Thanhouser Film.

+*Robin Hood** (1923, 118 min.). Director: Allan Dwan. With Enid Bennett, Douglas Fairbanks, Sr., Wallace Beery. Production: Douglas Fairbanks Pictures.

+*Robin Hood** (1973, 83 min.). Director: Wolfgang Reitherman. Voices of Brian Bedford, Monica Evans, Andy Devine. Production: Walt Disney Productions.

Animated.

+*Robin Hood** (1991, 116 min.). Director: John Irvin. With Uma Thurman, Patrick Bergin. Production: 20th Century Fox Television, CanWest Global Communications.

+*Robin Hood* (2006–09, 45 min.). Director: Varies. With Jonas Armstrong, Lucy Griffiths, Richard Armitage, Anjali Jay, Joanne Froggatt, Lara Pulver. Production: British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), Tiger Aspect Productions.

Television series; each season features a central female character, including an active, fighting Marian.

+*Robin Hood* (2010, 140 min.). Director: Ridley Scott. With Russell Crowe, Cate Blanchett. Production: Imagine Entertainment, Universal Pictures.

Director's cut runs 156 minutes.

+*Robin Hood: Prince of Sherwood** (1994, 67 min.). Director: James A. Hunter. With Jason Braly, Caroline Duncan. Production: JWH III Productions.

+*Robin Hood: Prince of Thieves** (1991, 138 min.). Director: Kevin Reynolds. With Mary Elizabeth Mastrantonio, Kevin Costner, Morgan Freeman. Production: Warner Bros., Morgan Creek Productions.

+*Robin Hood: Quest for the Crown** (1992, 93 min.). Directors: Lindsay Anderson, Peter Seabourne, and Bernard Knowles. With Bernadette O'Farrell, Richard Greene, Donald Pleasence. Production: British Broadcasting Corporation; ITC Entertainment.

Compilation from the Richard Greene television series.

+*Robin Hood: The Movie** (1991, 93 min.). Directors: Daniel Birt and Terence Fisher. With Bernadette O'Farrell, Richard Greene. Production: ITC Entertainment.

Made-for-television movie.

+*Robin of Sherwood** (1984–86, 60 min.). Director: Ian Sharp. With Judi Trott, Michael Praed. Production: Goldcrest Films International, Harlech Television.

Television series; the series pilot, “Robin Hood and the Sorcerer,” (120 min.) depicts Marian and Robin falling in love.

+*Rogues of Sherwood Forest** (1950, 79 min.). Director: Gordon Douglas. With Diana Lynn, John Derek. Production: Columbia Pictures.

+*Son of Robin Hood* (1959, 81 min.). Director: George Sherman. With June Laverick, David Hedison. Production: Argo Film Productions.

Robin's followers discover that his “son” is a clever and talented woman.

+*The Story of Robin Hood** (1952, 83 min.). Director: Ken Annakin. With Joan Rice, Richard Todd. Production: RKO Radio Pictures, Walt Disney Productions.

+*Sword of Sherwood Forest** (1960, 80 min.). Director: Terence Fisher. With Sarah Branch, Richard Greene. Production: Columbia Pictures Corporation, Hammer Film Productions.

Depicts Marian's deceit as she leads Robin into a trap.

+*Tales of Robin Hood** (1951, 60 min.). Director: James Tinling. With Mary Hatcher, Robert Clarke. Production: Lippert Pictures.

+*Wolfshead: The Legend of Robin Hood** [also known as *The Legend of Young Robin Hood*] (1969, 56 min.). Director: John Hough. With

Kathleen Byron, David Warbeck. Production: Hammer Film Productions, London Weekend Television.

Pilot for proposed television series.

+*The Zany Adventures of Robin Hood** (1984, 90 min.). Director: Ray Austin. With Morgan Fairchild, George Segal. Production: Charles Fries Productions.

Made-for-television movie.

Ronja rövardotter [also known as *The Robber's Daughter* and *Ronya*] (1984, 126 min.). Director: Tage Danielsson. With Lena Nyman, Hanna Zetterberg, Börje Ahstedt. Production: Svensk Filmindustri, Film Teknik, Norsk Film.

Based on Astrid Lindgren's 1981 novel, this is the fairy-tale romance of two star-crossed lovers.

THOUSAND AND ONE NIGHTS: The oral tradition of these Arabian tales can be traced to tenth-century Middle Eastern cultures. These nine films focus mostly on Aladdin, a peasant boy who falls in love with a princess. Other sections of the book focus on women, and the 1974 film *Arabian Nights* details the life of a female slave who becomes a ruler.

+*Aladdin** (1992, 83 min.). Directors: John Musker and Ron Clements. Voices of Scott Weinger, Robin Williams, Linda Larkin. Production: Walt Disney Pictures.

Animated.

+*Aladdin** (2000). Director: Geoff Posner. With Ed Byrne, Julian Clary, Patsy Kensit. Production: ITV.

British pantomime.

+*Aladdin** (2001, 59 min.). Director: Clive Harpwood. With Owen Money, Ieuan Rhys, Kelli Marie, Claire Marie Hall. Production: BBC Wales.

+*Aladdin and His Wonderful Lamp** (1985, 60 min.). Director: Tim Burton. With Valerie Bertinelli, Robert Carradine, James Earl Jones, Leonard Nimoy. Production: Shelley Duvall/Faerie Tale Theatre.

+*Arabian Adventure** (1979, 98 min.). Director: Kevin Connor. With Emma Samms, Christopher Lee. Production: EMI Films, British Lion Film Corporation.

+*Arabian Fantasy** (1988, 71 min.).

Animated.

+*Arabian Nights** (1942, 86 min.). Director: John Rawlins. With Maria Montez, Jon Hall. Production: Walter Wanger Productions, Universal Pictures.

+*Arabian Nights** (1974, 128 min.). Director: Pier Paolo Pasolini. With Ines Pellegrini, Franco Citti. Production: Produzioni Europee Associate, Productions Artistes Associés.

Part of Pasolini's Trilogy of Life with *Decameron* (1971) and *The Canterbury Tales* (1972).

+*Arabian Nights* (2000, 175 min.). Director: Steve Barron. With Mili Avital, James Frain. Production: Hallmark Entertainment.

Made-for-television miniseries retelling the classic stories, including stories about Ali Baba and Aladdin; multiple female characters.

The Virgin Spring [also known as *Jungfrukällan*] (1960, 88 min.). Director: Ingmar Bergman. With Birgitta Pettersson, Birgitta Valberg, Max Von Sydow. Production: Svensk Filmindustri.

Daughter of a deeply religious Swedish family is raped and murdered in medieval Sweden; based on a fourteenth-century fable.

A Walk with Love and Death (1969, 90 min.). Director: John Huston. With Anjelica Huston, Assaf Dayan. Production: Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation.

Based on Hans Koningsberger's 1961 novel, which recounts the love and deaths of a university student and a count's daughter during the Hundred Years War.

The War Lord (1965, 120 min.). Director: Franklin J. Schaffner. With Rosemary Forsyth, Charlton Heston. Production: Court Productions, Fraser Productions, Universal Pictures.

Depiction of the historically inaccurate *jus primae noctis*; based on Leslie Stevens's *The Lovers: A play in Three Acts* (1956).

The White Queen (2013, 60 min.). Director: Varies. With Rebecca Ferguson, Amanda Hale, Faye Marsay. Production: BBC Drama Productions.

Television series based on Philippa Gregory's *The Cousins' War* novels; focuses on the lives of Elizabeth Woodville, Margaret Beaufort, and Anne Neville.

Yolanda (1924, 74 min.). Director: Robert G. Vignola. With Theresa Maxwell Conover, Marion Davies. Production: Metro-Goldwyn Pictures.

Based on Charles Major's 1905 novel *Yolanda: Maid of Burgundy*, describes the story of two disguised lovers; the commoner Yolanda is really a princess of Burgundy, the knight, the prince of Styria.

*Your Highness** (2011, 102 min.). Director: David Gordon Green. With Danny McBride, James Franco, Natalie Portman. Production: Universal Pictures, Stuber Productions.

Comedy mocking the quest and rescue motif.

C. WOMEN IN FOLKLORE

The 10th Kingdom [*The Tenth Kingdom*] (2000, 417 min.). Directors: David Carson and Herbert Wise. With Kimberly Williams-Paisley, Scott Cohen, John Larroquette, Dianne Wiest. Production: Babelsberg Film und Fernsehen, Carnival Films, Hallmark Entertainment.

Made-for-television miniseries; a young woman and her father enter a fairytale world; references many well-known fairytales including "Snow White," "Sleeping Beauty," "Cinderella," "Beauty and the Beast," and "Little Red Riding Hood."

BEAUTY AND THE BEAST: Unless otherwise noted, the basic story line of these films is that a young woman saves her father by agreeing to live with a beast, who through her love returns to his natural state, a prince.

+*Beauty and the Beast* (1946, 90 min.). Directors: Jean Cocteau and René Clément. With Josette Day, Jean Marais. Production: DisCina.

Set in the twentieth century.

+*Beauty and the Beast* (1962, 77 min.). Director: Edward L. Cahn. With Joyce Taylor, Mark Damon. Production: Robert E. Kent Productions.

Young woman defends handsome prince who is the victim of curse that turns him into werewolf-like beast each night.

+*Beauty and the Beast* (1983, 52 min.). Director: Roger Vadim. With Susan Sarandon, Klaus Kinski. Production: Shelley Duvall/Faerie Tale Theatre.

Beauty and the Beast (1987–90, 48 min.). Director: Varies. With Ron Perlman, Linda Hamilton. Production: Witt/Thomas Productions, Republic Pictures.

Updated to the twentieth century; relationship between female lawyer and man-beast who lives in a secret underground community.

+*Beauty and the Beast* (1991, 85 min.). Directors: Gary Trousdale and Kirk Wise. Voices of Paige O'Hara, Robby Benson. Production: Walt Disney Pictures, Silver Screen Partners IV.

Animated.

+*Beauty and the Beast* (2012–, 45 min.). Director: Varies. With Kristin Kruek, Jay Ryan. Production: Take 5 Productions, Whizbang Films, CBS Television Studios.

Remake of the 1987 television series.

+*Beauty and the Beast* (2012, 60 min.). Director: Varies. With Ruth Bradley, Darius Campbell. Production: ABC Studios.

Television series.

+*Beauty and the Beast: A Latter-Day Tale* (2007, 93 min.). Director: Brian Brough. With Summer Naomi Smart, Matthew Reese. Production: Candlelight Media.

Modern adaptation of the story; removes physical transformation of the beast and replaces it with spiritual transformation.

+*Beastly* (2011, 86 min.). Director: Daniel Barnz. With Alex Pettyfer, Vanessa Hudgens, Mary-Kate Olsen. Production: Storefront Pictures; CBS Films.

Film version of the 2007 Alex Flinn novel.

+*Blood of Beasts* [also called *Beauty and the Beast*] (2003, 89 min.). Director: David Lister. With Jane March, William Gregory Lee, Justin Whalin. Production: Sony Pictures Home Entertainment.

Set in the time of the Vikings; a man cursed by Odin holds a Viking princess captive.

+*Shrek* (2001, 90 min.). Directors: Andrew Adamson and Vicky Jensen. Voices of Mike Myers, Eddie Murphy, Cameron Diaz. Production: DreamWorks Animation.

Animated story of an ogre on a quest to protect his property; contains themes of physical beauty, transformation, and female agency; references many female-driven fairytales, especially “Beauty and the Beast”; followed by three sequels that reference other fairytales, including “Cinderella” and briefly introduce the Arthurian Legend.

+*Passione d’amore* [also known as *Passion of Love*] (1982, 118 min.). Director: Ettore Scola. With Laura Antonelli, Valerie D’Obici. Production: Massfilm, Les Films Marceau.

Based on Iginio Ugo Tarchetti’s novel *Fosca* (2009); ugly woman pursues handsome cavalry officer.

*Boy Who Left Home to Find Out About the Shivers** (1983, 11 min.). Director: Graeme Clifford. With Vincent Price, Peter MacNicol, Dana Hill. Production: Shelley Duvall/Faerie Tale Theatre.

Set on a mythical island with defined male and female roles; uses motif of concealed nobility common to medieval romance.

Brave (2012, 95 min.). Directors: Mark Andrews and Brenda Chapman. Voices of Kelly Macdonald, Billy Connolly, Emma Thompson. Production: Walt Disney Pictures, Pixar Animation Studios.

Story of a heroine wanting to control her fate; set in medieval Scotland.

CINDERELLA: The basic story, that of a young woman who regains access to wealth after becoming a servant due to the actions of her stepmother, appears in many cultures, including ancient China.

+*Abadeha Neo-Ethnic Rock Cinderella* (2007). Director: Myrna J.

de la Paz. With Sue Prado, Lauren Novero. Production: Goldphin Entertainment.

Musical.

+*Cinderella* (1950, 75 min.). Directors: Clyde Geronimi and Wilfred Jackson. Voices of Ilene Woods, Verna Felton. Production: Walt Disney Productions.

Animated.

+*Cinderella* (1985, 60 min.). Director: Mark Cullingham. With Jean Stapleton, Jennifer Beals, Matthew Broderick. Production: Shelley Duvall/Faerie Tale Theatre.

+*CBeebies Panto: Strictly Cinderella* (2011, 29 min.). Director: Helen Sheppard. With Katrina Bryan, Alex Winters. Production: British Broadcasting Corporation.

Pantomime.

+*Cinderella* (1997, 88 min.). Director: Robert Iscove. With Brandy Norwood, Bernadette Peters, Paolo Montalban, Whitney Houston, Whoopi Goldberg. Production: BrownHouse Productions, Walt Disney Home Entertainment.

Remake of the Rodgers and Hammerstein musical.

+*Cinderella* (2000, 90 min.). Director: Beeban Kidron. With Kathleen Turner, Marcella Plunkett, Jane Birkin. Production: Gull Multimedia International.

Set in the twentieth century while retaining magical aspects.

+*Cinderella* (2000, 90 min.). Director: Liddy Oldroyd. With Samantha Womack, Siân Phillips, Julian Clary. Production: Wishbone Productions.

A televised pantomime.

+*Cinderella* (2008, 60 min.). Director: Peter Lydon. With James Nesbitt, Maxine Peake. Production: Hat Trick Productions.

Set in a modern university, features characters debating the roles of women in history; one part of season 1 of the BBC's "Fairy Tales."

+*A Cinderella Story* (2004, 95 min.). Director: Mark Rosman. With Hilary Duff, Jennifer Coolidge, Chad Michael Murray. Production: Warner Bros. Pictures.

Modernized retelling in a high school; two sequels, *Another Cinderella Story* (2008) and *A Cinderella Story: Once Upon a Song* (2011).

+*Cinderella 3D [Cendrillon au Far West]* (2012, 81 min.). Director: Pascal Hérold. Voices of Alexandra Lamy, Yolande Moreau. Production: Herold and Family, Nexus Factory, uFilm.

Animated story mixing the fairy tale with the wild west.

+*Cinderella Moon [Little Sister]* (2010). Director: Richard Bowen. With Xiao Min, Zhang Jie, Caiping Wang. Production: Louisa Productions.

Retelling of a Chinese version.

+*Confessions of an Ugly Stepsister* (2002, 90 min.). Director: Gavin Millar. With Stockard Channing, Azura Skye, Emma Poole, Jenna Harrison. Production: Alliance Atlantis Communications, Glass Slipper Productions.

Made-for-television retelling; loosely based on Gregory Maguire's 1999 book (which focuses on a family forced to flee England to live in The Netherlands).

+*Ella Enchanted* (2004, 95 min.). Director: Tommy O'Haver. With Anne Hathaway, Hugh Dancy. Production: Miramax Films, Jane Startz Productions.

Based on Gail Carson Levine's 1997 book about a young girl cursed

to obey any command who must find a way to overcome her fairy godmother's gift.

+*Elle: A Modern Cinderella Tale* (2010, 90 min.). Directors: John Dunson and Sean Dunson. With Ashlee Hewitt, Sterling Knight. Production: Dunson Twin Films, Frame of Mind Entertainment.

Modernized version set in the music industry.

+*Ever After* (1998, 121 min.). Director: Andy Tennant. With Drew Barrymore, Anjelica Huston, Dougray Scott. Production: Twentieth Century Fox.

Offers a fictional origin of the Cinderella narrative in pre-revolution France; removes magical aspects.

+*The Glass Slipper* (1955, 93 min.). Director: Charles Walters. With Leslie Caron, Michael Wilding. Production: Metro-Golden-Mayer.

Musical retelling; removes the element of magic.

+*The Slipper and the Rose: The Story of Cinderella [The Slipper and the Rose]* (1976, 146 min.). Director: Bryan Forbes. With Gemma Craven, Richard Chamberlain, Annette Crosbie. Production: Paradine Co-Productions.

Musical version; adds themes of social class and love and the role of marriage in political security.

+*A Tale of Cinderella* (1998, 129 min.). Directors: Patricia DiBenedetto Snyder and Tom Gliserman. With Christianne Tisdale, Vanessa Thorpe, Erika Johnson Newell. Production: Warner Home Video.

Originally produced by New York State Theatre Institute.

+*Year of the Fish* (2007, 96 min.). Director: David Kaplan. With Tsai Chin, Ken Leung, Randall Duk Kim, An Nguyen. Production: Funny Cry Happy, Caruso-Mendelsohn Productions.

Animated modernization based on a Chinese version of the story.

+*Z'olushka [Cinderella]* (2003, 149 min.). Director: Semyon Gorov. With: Yuliya Mavrina, Nikolay Baskov. Production: Telekanal INTER, Channel One Russia.

Russian version of the Cinderella story.

The Dancing Princesses (1984, 50 min.). Director: Peter Medak. With Lesley Ann Warren, Roy Dotrice. Production: Shelley Duvall/Faerie Tale Theater.

Hand of eldest daughter offered to anyone who can learn the princesses' secret.

Dragonheart (1996, 103 min.). Director: Rob Cohen. With Julie Christie, Dina Meyer, Dennis Quaid, Sean Connery. Production: Universal Pictures.

Woman teams with dragonslayer to challenge wicked king.

+*Enchanted* (2007, 107 min.). Director: Kevin Lima. With Amy Adams, Patrick Dempsey, James Marsden, Idina Menzel. Production: Walt Disney Pictures.

Animated fairytale heroine enters the "real" and non-animated world; explores the meaning of "happily ever after" while referencing numerous Disney fairytales including "Cinderella," "Snow White," "Sleeping Beauty," and "Beauty and the Beast"; multiple female characters and feminist themes including feminine identity within relationships and marriage.

Fairy Tales (2008, 60 min.). Director and cast vary. Production: Hat Trick Productions.

British television series modernizing fairy tales; four episodes in total: "Rapunzel," "Cinderella," "The Empress's New Clothes," and "Billy Goat."

Fractured Fairy Tales (1959, 45 min.). Directors: Jay Ward, Bill Scott. Voices of June Foray, Julie Bennett, Edward Everett Horton, Daws Butler, Bill Scott, Paul Frees. Production: Jay Ward Productions.

Produced for the television shows “Rocky and His Friends” (ABC 1959–61) and “The Bullwinkle Show” (NBC 1961–64), these short episodes take traditional fairy tales and add unexpected or ironic characters and plot twists. The ninety one shorts include “Rapunzel,” “Rumpelstiltskin,” “Cinderella,” “Sleeping Beauty,” and “Snow White.”

The Frog King [*Der Froschkönig, The Frog King/The Meaning of Fear*] (2008, 59 min.). Director: Franziska Buch. With Sidonie von Krosigk, Alexander Merbeth. Production: Bavaria Filmverleih- und Produktions GmbH.

Includes “The Meaning of Fear,” based on *The Boy Who Left Home to Find Out About the Shivers*.

+ *The Princess and the Frog* (2009, 97 min.). Directors: Ron Clements and John Musker. Voices of Anika Noni Rose, Bruno Campos. Production: Walt Disney Feature Animation.

Retelling of “The Frog Prince” based on the Brothers Grimm story and E. D. Baker’s *The Frog Princess* (2002); heroine in animal form for much of the film.

Game of Thrones (2011–, 60 min.). Director: Varies. With Peter Dinklage, Lena Headey, Maisie Williams, Emilia Clark. Production: Home Box Office (HBO).

Television series based on *A Song of Ice and Fire*, a fantasy novel series by George R. R. Martin; several prominent female characters.

ST. GEORGE: Films often focus on the role of a lone knight and rescue of a heroine.

*George and the Dragon** [also known as *Dragon Sword*] (2004, 93 min.). Director: Tom Reeve. With James Purefoy, Piper Perabo, Patrick Swayze. Production: Carousel Picture Company.

A returning crusader saves a kingdom and rescues a princess while also having to consider how humans and dragons fail to coexist; forbidden love; heroine's actions key to the plot.

*The Magic Sword** [also known as *St. George and the Dragon*] (1962, 80 min.). Director: Bert I. Gordon. With Estelle Winwood, Anne Helm, Gary Lockwood, Basil Rathbone. Production: Bert I. Gordon Productions.

Witch helps knight on quest to rescue imprisoned princess.

Grimm (2011–, 43 min.). Director: Varies. Actors: David Giuntoli, Bitsie Tulloch, Silas Weir Mitchell. Production: GK Productions, Universal Television.

Television series mixing the Grimm fairy tales and other fairy tale elements with a weekly cop show; each episode focuses on a different fairy tale, including “Rapunzel” and “Cinderella.”

How to Train Your Dragon (2010, 98 min.). Directors: Dean DeBlois and Chris Sanders. Voices of Jay Baruchel, America Ferrera. Production: DreamWorks Animation.

Animated adventure of a boy saving a dragon; large role for the active heroine who is shown fighting and often challenging the hero.

Ladyhawke (1985, 121 min.). Director: Richard Donner. With Michelle Pfeiffer, Matthew Broderick, Rutger Hauer, Leo McKern. Production: Twentieth Century Fox, Warner Bros.

Fantasy quest about star-crossed medieval lovers who are cursed to live as animals.

The Lost Empire [*The Monkey King*] (2001, 170 min.). Director: Peter MacDonald. With Thomas Gibson, Bai Ling, Russell Wong. Production: Babelsberg International Film Produktion, Hallmark Home Entertainment.

Made-for-television reinvention of the sixteenth-century Chinese novel *Journey to the West*; focus on magic and myth.

Magnificat (1993, 110 min.). Director: Pupi Avati. With Luigi Diberti, Arnaldo Ninchi, Eleonora Alessandrelli, Lorella Morlotti. Production: Duca Film, Istituto Luce, Ital-Noleggio Cinematografico.

Young girl becomes monastic oblate; depiction of the historically inaccurate *jus primae noctis*.

The Margrave's Daughter [also known as *La fille du margrave*] (1912). Directors: Louis Feuillade and Léonce Perret. With Yvette Andréyor, André Luguet. Production: Gaumont.

Thwarted lovers are rewarded for their devotion as both risk their lives to save a condemned man.

The Mask and the Sword [also known as *Gypsy Fury*, *Saga of Singoalla*, *Singoalla*, and *Wind Is My Lover*] (1949, two parts, 104 min., 63 min.). Director: Christian Jaque. With Marie-Hélène Dasté, Viveca Lindfors, Michel Auclair. Production: Terrafilm.

Set in fourteenth-century Sweden; a lord falls for Singoalla, a gypsy, and they secretly marry. The gypsies steal the castle's treasure and take Singoalla away, but she returns many years later with their son and the treasure.

The Midwife's Tale (1995, 75 min.). Director: Megan Siler. With Stacey Havener, Carla Milford. Production: Heresy Pictures.

A feminist fairy tale; shows Lady Eleanor's escape from a dreadful marriage, the abortion of their child, and her subsequent happiness in a lesbian relationship with a midwife.

Mulan (1998, 88 min.). Directors: Tony Bancroft and Barry Cook. Voices of Ming-Na Wen, Lea Salonga, Eddie Murphy. Production: Walt Disney Feature Animation.

A young peasant woman in fifth-century China disguises herself as man in order to fight invading Mongols; animated; based on a Chinese legend.

Nonnen fra Asminderød [also known as *The Life of a Nun* and *The Nun*] (1911). With Carl Alstrup, Edith Buermann, Victor Fabian. Production: Nordisk Film, Great Northern Films.

A lusty monk thwarts the plans of young girl and her lover and attacks her, but she repels him only to be accused of blasphemy and sentenced to death; her lover saves her and they are married.

Petronella (1985, 30 min.). Director: Rick Locke. With Sylvia Hutton, Mayf Nutter, James Arrington. Production: Wonderland Video.

Young queen sets out to find a prince in need of rescue; made-for-television musical.

The Princess and the Goblin [also known as *A Hercegnő és a kobold*] (1993, 82 min.). Director: József Gémes. Voices of Sally Ann Marsh, Peter Murray. Production: Siriol Productions.

Based on George MacDonald's 1872 novel, the princess and a miner fight evil goblins; animated.

THE PRINCESS AND THE PEA: Tale where a young woman's identity is in question. Motif of unknown royalty.

+*The Princess and the Pea* (1984, 53 min.). Director: Tony Bill. With Liza Minnelli, Tom Conti. Production: Shelley Duvall/Faerie Tale Theatre.

+*Once Upon a Mattress* (2005, 90 min.). Director: Kathleen Marshall. With Carol Burnett, Denis O'Hare, Tracey Ullman. Production: ABC Video, Touchstone Television.

Musical.

Once Upon a Time (2011–, 45 min.). Director: Varies. With Ginnifer Goodwin, Jennifer Morrison, Lana Parrilla. Production: ABC Studios, Kitsis/Horowitz.

Television series built around the story of Snow White; other fairy tales and heroines including Belle and Cinderella referenced.

Pan's Labyrinth [*El laberinto del fauno*] (2009, 119 min.), Director: Guillermo del Toro. With Sergi López, Maribel Verdú, Ivana Baquero. Production: Estudios Picasso, Tequila Gang, Esperanto Filmoj.

Story of a young girl in Spain returning to her former life as a princess in an underground world; many fairy tales referenced.

The Princess Bride (1987, 98 min.). Director: Rob Reiner. With Carol Kane, Robin Wright, Cary Elwes, Mandy Patinkin. Production: Act III Communications, Buttercup Films.

Princess rescued by hero who combats monsters and evil; this fantasy quest is an adaptation of William Goldman's 1998 novel.

The Princess Who Had Never Laughed (1984, 52 min.). Director: Mark Cullingham. With Ellen Barkin, Howard Hesseman, Howie Mandel. Production: Shelley Duvall/Faerie Tale Theatre.

Princess's hand in marriage offered to anyone who can make her laugh.

RAPUNZEL: Tale where a heroine is often traded for an herb and then is later imprisoned by a witch.

+*Rapunzel* (1982, 51 min.). Director: Gilbert Cates. With Gena Rowlands, Shelley Duvall, Jeff Bridges. Production: Shelley Duvall/Faerie Tale Theatre.

+*Rapunzel* (2009, 59 min.). Director: Bodo Fürneisen. With Suzanne von Borsody, Luisa Wietzorek. Production: ANTAEUS Film- und Fernsehproduktionsgesellschaft mbH.

In German.

+*Tangled* (2010, 100 min.). Directors: Nathan Greno and Byron Howard. Voices of Mandy Moore, Zachary Levi, Donna Murphy. Production: Walt Disney Pictures.

Animated retelling of “Rapunzel”; greater agency for the heroine as she is shown leaving her tower and achieving her dreams to see life outside her tower.

RUMPELSTILTSKIN: A beautiful young woman, who must spin straw into gold, fears the loss of her firstborn. Based on the tale by the Brothers Grimm.

+*Rumplestiltskin* (1980, 53 min.). Director: Emile Ardolino. With Shelley Duvall, Ned Beatty. Production: Shelley Duvall/Faerie Tale Theatre.

+*Rumplestiltskin* (1986, 30 min.). Director: Pino Van Lamsweerde. Voices of Charity Brown, Robert Bockstael, Christopher Plummer. Production: Atkinson Film Arts, Téléfilm Canada.

Animated.

+*Rumplestiltskin* (1987, 85 min.). Director: David Irving. With Amy Irving, Billy Barty. Production: Cannon Group.

Musical.

SLEEPING BEAUTY: Older tales detail the rape of Beauty and the birth of twins while she sleeps; these more recent adaptations focus on the motif of the princess rescued by the prince.

+*Dornröschen* (2009, 59 min.). Director: Oliver Dieckmann. With Lotte Flack, François Goeske, Hannelore Eisner, Anna Loos. Production: Bavaria Filmverleih- und Produktions GmbH.

In German.

+*Dornröschen* (2008, 81 min.). Director: Arend Agthe. With Anna Hausburg, Moritz Schulze. Production: Moviepool, Provobis Film.

In German.

+*La belle au bois dormant* [*The Sleeping Beauty*] (2000, 149 min.). Director: Pierre Cavassilas. With Aurélie Dupont, Manuel Legris. Production: Arte.

Performance of Tchaikovsky's ballet by the Paris Opera Ballet.

+*Sleeping Beauty* (1959, 75 min.). Director: Clyde Geronimi. Voices of Mary Costa, Bill Shirley. Production: Walt Disney Productions.

The classic tale with Tchaikovsky's music; animated.

+*Sleeping Beauty* (1983, 60 min.). Director: Jeremy Kagan. With Beverly D'Angelo, Bernadette Peters, Christopher Reeve. Production: Shelley Duvall/Faerie Tale Theatre.

+*Sleeping Beauty* (1987, 90 min.). Director: David Irving. With Morgan Fairchild, Tahnee Welch, Nicholas Clay. Production: Golan-Globus Productions.

+*Teen Sorcery* (1999, 90 min.). Director: Victoria Muspratt. With A. J. Cook, Craig Olejnik, Lexa Doig. Production: Canarom Productions, Castel Film Romania.

SNOW WHITE: Archetype of witch abusing an innocent girl. In addition to the traditional story line in which the prince saves Snow White, these films depict female vanity and jealousy over another's beauty.

+*Blanche Neige* [*Schneewittchen, Preljocaj's Snövit*] (2009, 90 min.). Director: Angelin Preljocaj. With Nagisa Shirai, Sergio Díaz, Céline Galli. Production: Arte, Ballet Preljocaj.

Ballet.

+*Mirror Mirror* (2012, 106 min.). Director: Tarsem Singh. With Lily Collins, Julia Roberts, Armie Hammer. Production: Relativity Media.

+*Schneewittchen* (2009, 59 min.). Director: Thomas Freundner. With Sonja Kirchberger, Laura Berlin. Productions: Saxonia Media Filmproduktion GmbH.

In German.

+*Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* (1984, 60 min.). Director: Peter Medak. With Elizabeth McGovern, Vanessa Redgrave, Vincent Price. Production: Shelley Duvall/Faerie Tale Theatre.

+*Snow White* (1987, 85 min.). Director: Michael Berz. With Diana Rigg, Sarah Patterson, Billy Barty. Production: Golan-Globus Productions.

+*Snow White* [*Snow White: The Fairest of Them All*] (2001, 93 min.). Director: Caroline Thompson. With Miranda Richardson, Kristin Kreuk. Production: Babelsberg International Film Produktion, Hallmark Entertainment.

Transforms the original story making Snow White a peasant and integrating demonic magic.

+*Snow White and the Huntsman* (2012, 127 min.). Director: Rupert Sanders. With Kristen Stewart, Chris Hemsworth, Charlize Theron. Production: Roth Films, Universal Pictures.

Medieval setting for the Snow White story.

+*Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* (1937, 83 min.). Directors: William Cottrell and Ben Sharpsteen. Voices of Adriana Caselotti, Lucille La Verne. Production: Disney.

Animated.

+*Willa: An American Snow White* (1998, 88 min.). Director: Tom Davenport. With Caitlin O'Connell, Becky Stark. Production: Davenport Films.

Sets the story in a traveling medicine show in the American South in the early 1900s.

THUMBELINA: In these three versions, tiny maiden rejects suitors, choosing to wait for the prince of her dreams.

+*Thumbelina* (1984, 60 min.). Director: Michael Lindsay-Hogg. With Carrie Fisher, William Katt, Burgess Meredith. Production: Shelley Duvall/Faerie Tale Theatre, Playtpus Productions.

+*Thumbelina* (1989, 30 min.). Director: Tim Raglin. With Kelly McGillis, Mark Isham. Production: Rabbit Ears Productions.

+*Thumbelina* (1994, 86 min.). Directors: Don Bluth and Gary Goldman. Voices of Jodi Benson, Gino Conforti, Barbara Cook. Production: Don Bluth.

Animated.

The Swan Princess (1994, 90 min.). Director: Richard Rich. Voices of Howard McGillin, Michelle Nicastro, Jack Palance. Production: Nest Family Entertainment, Rich Animation Studios.

Animated retelling of *Swan Lake*.

References

TEACHING WITH FILM

- Aberth, John. *A Knight at the Movies: Medieval History on Film*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Aronstein, Susan Lynn. *Hollywood Knights: Arthurian Cinema and the Politics of Nostalgia*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Attreed, Lorraine, and James F. Powers. "Lessons in the Dark: Teaching the Middle Ages with Film." *Perspectives* 35, no. 1 (1997): 11-16.
- Bernau, Anke, and Bettina Bildhauer, eds. *Medieval Film*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009.
- Bildhauer, Bettina. *Filming the Middle Ages*. London: Reaktion Books, 2011.
- Blanton, Virginia. "Don't Worry. I Won't Let Them Rape You': Guinevere's Agency in Jerry Bruckheimer's King Arthur." *Arthuriana* 15, no. 3 (2005): 91-111. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27870703>.
- Boyle, Sara. "From Victim to Avenger: The Women in John Boorman's Excalibur." *Avalon to Camelot* 1 (1984): 42-43.
- Blaetz, Robin. *Visions of the Maid: Joan of Arc in American Film and Culture*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001.
- Burt, Richard. "Getting Schmedieval: Of Manuscript and Film Prologues, Paratexts, and Parodies." *Exemplaria* 19, no. 2 (2007): 217-42. doi:10.1179/175330707X212840.
- . *Medieval and Early Modern Film and Media*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- . "Re-embroidering the Bayeux Tapestry in Film and Media: The Flip Side of History in Opening and End Title Sequences." *Exemplaria* 19, no. 2 (2007): 327-50. doi:10.1179/175330707X212895
- De La Bretèque, François Amy. *L'imaginaire médiéval dans le cinéma occidental*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2004.

- Dell, Helen. "Past, Present, Future Perfect: Paradigms of History in Medievalism Studies." *Parergon* 25, no. 2 (2008): 58-79. doi: 10.1353/pgn.0.0057.
- Driver, Martha, "More on Medieval Movies: Surveys from the Field." *Film and History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Film and Television Studies* 29, nos. 3-4 (1999): 5-7. doi: .1353/flm.1999.0018.
- . "Teaching the Middle Ages on Film: Visual Narrative and the Historical Record," *History Compass* 5, no. 1 (2007): 159-74. doi: 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2006.00378.x.
- . "Writing about Medieval Movies: Authenticity and History." *Film and History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Film and Television Studies* 29, nos. 1-2 (1999): 5-7. doi: 10.1353/flm.1999.0037.
- Driver, Martha W., and Sid Ray, eds. *The Medieval Hero on Screen: Representations from Beowulf to Buffy*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2004.
- Elliott, Andrew B. R. *Remaking the Middle Ages: The Methods of Cinema and History in Portraying the Medieval World*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2011.
- Erens, Patricia, ed. *Sexual Strategems: The World of Women in Film*. New York: Horizon, 1980.
- Finke, Laurie, and Martin B. Shichtman. *Cinematic Illuminations: The Middle Ages on Film*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010.
- Forni, Kathleen. "Popular Chaucer: The BBC's Canterbury Tales." *Parergon* 25, no. 1 (2008): 171-89. doi: 10.1353/pgn.0.0041.
- Gaylon, Aubrey, and Kevin J. Harty. "Films." In *The New Arthurian Encyclopedia*, edited by Norris J. Lacy. New York: Garland, 1991.
- Harty, Kevin J. "Cinema Arthuriana: A Bibliography of Selected Secondary Materials." *Arthurian Interpretations* 3, no. 2 (1989): 119-37. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27868664>.
- , ed. *Cinema Arthuriana: Essays on Arthurian Film*. New York: Garland, 1991.
- , ed. *Cinema Arthuriana: Twenty Essays*. Revised edition. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2002.
- . "Cinema Arthuriana: Translations of the Arthurian Legend

- to the Screen.” *Arthurian Interpretations* 2, no. 1 (1987): 95-113.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27868632>.
- , “The Decameron on Film.” In *Approaches to Teaching Boccaccio’s Decameron*, edited by James H. McGregor, 164-71. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 2000.
- . “Film Treatments of the Legend of King Arthur.” In *King Arthur Through the Ages*, edited by Valerie M. Lagorio and Mildred Leake Day, 1:278-90. New York: Garland, 1990.
- , ed. *King Arthur on Film: New Essays on Arthurian Cinema*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1999.
- . *The Reel Middle Ages: American, Western and Eastern European, Middle Eastern and Asian Films about Medieval Europe*. 2nd ed. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2006.
- . “Teaching Arthurian Film.” In *Approaches to Teaching the Arthurian Tradition*, edited by Maureen Fries and Jeanie Watson, 148-50. New York: Modern Language Association of American, 1992.
- ., ed. *The Vikings on Film: Essays on Depictions of the Nordic Middle Ages*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2011.
- Haydock, Nickolas. *Movie Medievalism: The Imaginary Middle Ages*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2008.
- . “Shooting the Messenger: Luc Besson at War with Joan of Arc.” *Exemplaria* 19, no. 2 (2007): 243-69.
 doi:10.1179/175330707X212859.
- Haydock, Nickolas, and E. L. Ridsen, eds. *Hollywood in the Holy Land: Essays on Film Depictions of the Crusades and Christian-Muslim Clashes*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2009.
- Kelly, Kathleen Coyne. “Hollywood Simulacrum: The Knights of the Round Table (1953).” *Exemplaria* 19, no. 2 (2007): 270-89.
 doi:10.1179/175330707X212868.
- Kelly, Kathleen Coyne, and Tison Pugh, eds. *Queer Movie Medievalisms*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2009.
- Kiening, Christian, and Heinrich Adolf, eds. *Mittelalter im Film*. Trends in Medieval Philology 6. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Krasilovsky, Alexis. “Woman Teaching Women: Teaching Film to Coed Classes in the 1980s.” *The Velvet Light Trap* 27 (1991): 73-76.

- “Le Moyen Âge au cinéma.” *Cahiers du cinéma* 42-43 (1985): 5-182.
- Lupack, Alan, and Kevin J. Harty, eds. *Screening Camelot: Further Studies of Arthurian Cinema*. *Arthuriana* 10, no.4 (2000): 1-86. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/127869582>.
- MacCurdy, Marian. “Bitch or Goddess: Polarized Images of Women in Arthurian Literature and Films.” *Platte Valley Review* 18 (1990): 3-24.
- Marshall, David W., ed. *Mass Market Medieval: Essays on the Middle Ages in Popular Culture*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2007.
- Martensen-Larsen, Britta. “Die Bedeutung mittelalterlicher Miniaturen für Carl Th. Dreyers Film ‘La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc’” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 55, H. 1 (1992): 136-49. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1482604>.
- Mayne, Judith. “The Female Audience and the Feminist Critic.” *Woman and Literature*, n.s. 4 (1988): 22-40.
- Meier, Mischa, and Simona Slanička, eds. *Antike und Mittelalter im Film: Konstruktion, Dokumentation, Projektion*. Beiträge zur Geschichtskultur, Bd. 29. Cologne: Böhlau, 2007.
- Morgan, Gwendolyn. “Modern Mystics, Medieval Saints.” *Studies in Medievalism* 12 (2002): 39-54.
- Nollen, Scott Allen. *Robin Hood: A Cinematic History of the English Outlaw and His Scottish Counterparts*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1999.
- Olton, Bert. *Arthurian Legends on Film and Television*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000.
- Penne, R. “De middeleeuwen in Technicolor.” *Film en Televisie* 394 (1990): 26.
- Psaki, R. Regina. “Pasolini’s Decameron and Teaching the Middle Ages.” *Medieval Feminist Newsletter* 23 (1997): 47-52.
- Ramey, Lynn T., and Tison Pugh, eds. *Race, Class, and Gender in “Medieval” Cinema*. The New Middle Ages. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Risden, E. L. “The Cinematic Sexualizing of Beowulf.” *Essays in Medieval Studies* 26 (2010): 109-15. doi:10.1353/ems.2010.0004.
- Robinson, Carol L., and Pamela Clements, eds. *Neomedievalism*

- in the Media: Essays on Film, Television, and Electronic Games.*
Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2012.
- Shippey, Tom, and Martin Arnold, eds. *Film and Fiction: Reviewing the Middle Ages.* Studies in Medievalism 12. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003.
- Sklar, Elizabeth S., and Donald L. Hoffman, eds. *King Arthur in Popular Culture.* Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2002.
- Stanbury, Sarah. "Feminist Film Theory: Seeing Chrétien's Enide." *Literature and Psychology* 36 (1990): 47-66.
- Torregrossa, Michael. "Merlin Goes to the Movies: The Changing Role of Merlin in Cinema Arthuriana." *Film and History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Film and Television Studies* 29, nos. 3-4 (1999): 54-65. doi:10.1353/flm.1999.0008.
- Trigg, Stephanie. "Medievalism and Convergence Culture: Researching the Middle Ages for Fiction and Film." *Parergon* 25, no. 2 (2008): 99-118. doi:10.1353/pgn.0.0060.
- Williams, David John. "Medieval Movies: A Filmography." *Film and History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Film and Television Studies* 29, nos. 1-2 (1999): 20-32. doi:10.1353/flm.1999.0009.
- Yervasi, Carina. "The Faces of Joan: Cinematic Representations of Joan of Arc." *Film and History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Film and Television Studies* 29, nos. 3-4 (1999): 8-19. doi:10.1353/flm.1999.0024.

TEACHING THE SORCERESS: CRITICISM & REVIEWS

- Anderson, Katherine, Jill A. Frederick, Mary Suydam, Jacqueline E. Robbins, and Joan Cadden. Review of *Le moine et la sorcière.* *American Historical Review* 94, no. 4 (1989): 1037-39. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1906598>.
- Berger, Pamela. "The Film 'Sorceress': A Twentieth-Century Re-Creation of a Medieval Memory." *In Memory and the Middle Ages*, edited by Nancy Netzer and Virginia Reinberg. Boston, MA: Boston College Museum of Art, 1985.

- Borger, Lenny. "Humanities Endowment-backed 'Sorceress' Lensing in France." *Variety* 27, August 1986, 33.
- Les Films français*. Paris: Unifrance Film International, 1987.
- Ingalls, Zoe. "An Art Historian Applies her Skills to the Arcane, Demanding World of Movie Making." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1 August 1990, B5.
- Jackson, Lynne. "Sorceress: An Interview with Pamela Berger." *Cinéaste* 16 (1988): 45.
- Jhirad, Susan. Review in *Cinéaste* 16 (1988): 44, reprinted in *Film Review Annual* (1989): 1323-24.
- Kaufman, Bill. Review in *Newsday*, 2 April 1988, section 2: 10, reprinted in *Film Review Annual* (1989): 1326-27.
- Tous les films 1987*. Paris: Éditions Chrétien-Médias, 1988.

Essays on Teaching *The Sorceress*

Teaching the Sorceress

Fiona Harris Stoertz, Trent University

We . . . live in a world deluged with images, one in which people increasingly receive their ideas about the past from motion pictures and television, from feature films, docudramas, miniseries, and network documentaries. Today the chief source of historical knowledge for the bulk of the population—outside of the much-despised textbook—must surely be the visual media, a set of institutions which lie almost wholly outside the control of those of us who devote our lives to history.—Robert Rosenstone, *Visions of the Past*¹

A REALITY OF TEACHING HISTORY TODAY is that our students have absorbed many of their ideas about the past from film and television. The average undergraduate has spent a lifetime viewing these images, and even while in university will probably spend more time watching film and television than reading scholarly books about history.² As Rosenstone comments, professional historians usually contribute little to such visual representations of history, which often distort or ignore the “facts,” and even when historians are involved, as Rosenstone has been in at least two films, and the makers attempt to be true to the historical period, the results seldom are entirely satisfying even to those historians consulted on the project.³ The dilemma is particularly severe for medieval historians, since our society is besieged with images of the Middle Ages, not only from documentaries and films that purport to reflect reality, but also from pseudo-medieval video games and fantasy

1. Robert A. Rosenstone, *Visions of the Past: The Challenge of Film to our Idea of History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995), 22-23.

2. On this see Daniel J. Walkowitz, “Visual History: The Craft of the Historian-Filmmaker,” *The Public Historian* 7 (1985): 53. doi:10.2307/3377299.

3. Rosenstone, 19-44 and *passim*.

films which borrow elements of medieval culture. While students may recognize that such depictions of the Middle Ages are flawed and do not represent probable realities, the images nevertheless act as a lens through which they read and understand the Middle Ages.

Why then would I show students in my second year medieval survey, as I have done for the past four years, *The Sorceress*, a film which, as other contributors have shown, is seriously flawed in its depiction of the Middle Ages? My motive is not to give myself a break from lecturing or raise my enrollments, but to attempt to teach students to view films critically as works of history rather than passively as pure entertainment.

I only get the opportunity to present my vision of the Middle Ages to my students for a year or so—three or four years at best if they take several classes from me—whereas they will be watching movies and television for the rest of their lives. My best chance to combat the influence of visual media is to get students into the habit of thinking analytically and historically about the films they see. For a teacher of medieval history to denounce flawed films or simply ignore their existence does little good; the student remains the passive consumer. However, if we force students to critique a film themselves, giving them the tools with which to do it, the habit of looking at historical films critically will remain with them for life, long after they have forgotten who the Dominicans were and what precisely the difference between sorcery and heresy was.

A first step in encouraging students to approach historical films more critically—one that should be taken before one ever shows a film to students⁴—is to discuss the difference between the work of a film maker and the work of a historian.⁵ An advantage of film is its ability to present action, emotion, setting, and sound in a way that no written history ever

4. I have found that students are much better able to assess films historically if they are first encouraged to view them in a critical manner, even if they are simply told that the film they are about to see is flawed.

5. Particularly useful studies on this subject include Rosenstone and Walkowitz, cited above; Pierre Sorlin, *The Film in History: Restaging the Past* (Totowa: Barnes and Noble Books, 1980); Natalie Zemon Davis, “Any Resemblance to Persons Living or Dead?: Film and the Challenge of Authenticity,” *Yale Review* 76 (1987): 457-82; and the forum on film and history, including articles by several authors, in *American Historical Review* 93 (1988): 1173-1227, issue URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1332151>.

can. History literally comes alive on film. Yet, this miraculous quality of film is also a weakness when representing the Middle Ages. We cannot know all the details necessary to make a coherent film, and inevitably writers, directors, and the actors themselves must fill in the gaps to create satisfying settings and turn characters into believable human beings. Thus all films must involve an element of fiction. Postmodernists might point out that all written histories contain an element of fiction too—all historians must interpret the evidence to create their vision of what happened—but historians are likely to understand the historical context better than filmmakers and actors, and their use of footnotes and critical apparatus as well as the less emotionally compelling nature of the medium of historical writing allows the critical reader to assess sources and arguments to reach their own conclusions. In film, the primary sources are invisible and the narrative compelling enough that it is very easy to forget that one is watching a creation, not pure fact. Even when the details of a film are carefully researched, without the explanatory apparatus normally included in scholarly books, the meaning of certain aspects of the film may be misinterpreted or missed by the viewer, and underlying causes cannot be understood. As David Herlihy comments, “Films beautifully depict action and event but not the abiding structures that shaped the action and make the event, if not explained, at least understandable.”⁶

Perhaps the most serious flaw in film for historians is the fact that films tend to tell a story from one point of view, usually in fairly simplistic terms, with a beginning, a middle, and an end. Historians are accustomed to looking at many possibilities, showing different perspectives, interpretations, and historical debates. The filmmaker, to avoid alienating the viewer, must decide on one “truth,” obscuring or obliterating other alternatives. All too often, filmmakers choose the possibility most likely to fit the sensibilities and preconceptions of the viewer—the stereotypes in *The Sorceress*, present an excellent example: oppressive nobles, the wise healer, wily peasants. Extreme contrasts are favored as they make the film easy to understand and emotionally engage the viewer. While historians

6. David Herlihy, “Am I a Camera? Other Reflections on Film and History,” *American Historical Review* 93 (1988): 1186–92; 1190, doi:10.2307/1873533.

tend to portray history as a continuum, with far reaching causes and consequences, historical film usually must begin and end tidily, resulting in further distortion and oversimplification.

The Sorceress lends itself to this kind of analysis better than many films on the Middle Ages because it deals with a number of social groups and professions commonly studied in a medieval history survey. Thus students are likely to have the background to assess the characters critically and analytically, and recognize extreme stereotypes and distortions of fact. Students in my medieval survey discuss the film in the twentieth week of a twenty-four week course, after already having discussed primary sources and heard lectures about mendicants, women, heresy and the inquisition, peasants, nobles, art and architecture, the medieval church (popular and institutional), agriculture, and medicine. In fact, the exercise of critiquing the film encourages students to apply what they have learned throughout the course to the film, forcing them to think critically about both course material and film, and incidentally providing a wonderful review. I have my students discuss each “type” and topic individually, discussing what is well done and what is problematic or extreme. The results are very impressive: students find most of the flaws pointed out by other contributors, but they also are able to discuss the many aspects that seem accurate. I will limit myself to two examples here. They note that Étienne’s motives for entering the religious life—fear of bloodshed and guilt over the rape of a girl—while not impossible for a thirteenth-century noble, would probably not have been common motives and are designed to appeal to twentieth-century audiences who often find the concept of joining a mendicant order rather foreign; but they argue that many details are nicely done, such as his costume, his prefacing of sermons with stories, his fasts and vigils, and his association as a Dominican with the Inquisition. Likewise, having read portions of a scholarly medical text from the early fourteenth century, they recognize that herbal medicine was not scorned by intellectuals and reserved for wisewomen, but instead was widely used by doctors and monks, but they also find that some of the cures in the film, such as the use of elder blossoms, and the way such remedies were prepared do reflect actual practices that can be found in medical texts.

While the central plot of the film is more difficult for students to assess, another advantage to using the film is the existence of Jean-Claude

Schmitt's *The Holy Greyhound*, which translates the original story by Étienne de Bourbon, analyzes it, and assesses it in context, providing a useful scholarly accompaniment to the film. While some teachers might choose to assign the whole book, which traces the cult to the twentieth century, due to Canadian copyright restrictions, I assign only the medieval portions, approximately the first thirty-five pages, which look especially at the historical Étienne, the distinction between superstition (the cult of the greyhound) and heresy, popular religion, and the practices of the Inquisition. Having the primary source on which the film is “based,” students are able to see what portions of the film are entirely invented and recognize how the filmmakers have changed aspects of the original tale, transforming the instigator of the ritual from an old woman living in a neighboring town into a young and beautiful wisewoman, who lives in a drafty hut in the woods, speaks to wolves, and possesses knowledge not understood by elites; softening the ritual itself from a rather nasty rite in which women toss a baby back and forth, leave it alone in the woods, and dunk it nine times in a fast-flowing river to a gentler rite in which the baby is passed from hand to hand, supervised at all times and protected by the magical powers of the wise woman, and the dunking is omitted; and transforming the punishment meted out by the inquisitor from a pointed sermon, destruction of dog and grove, and end of access to the grove to a trial and condemnation for heresy and eleventh hour rescue. These changes readily lend themselves to a discussion of the needs and goals of filmmakers, vs. those of historians, as students readily recognize that these changes have been made because of the demands of the medium, to make the participants in the rite more “sympathetic,” to provide drama, and to make a romantic attraction (an essential element of most popular films) between Étienne and the wise-woman more plausible.

I should note that while the *Sorceress* is a beautiful film, one with a 2.5 million dollar budget, it is not a slick “Hollywood” film.⁷ While students generally enjoy it, they find it a bit trite—the line “bees sting, but they also bring honey” always brings a roar of laughter or groans. The choice of the original French, poor dubbing, or subtitles further tends

7. Bill Kaufman, review in *Newsday*, 2 April 1988, section 2: 10, reprinted in *Film Review Annual* (1989): 1326-27.

to distance students somewhat from the film and prevent them from regarding it as pure entertainment. Thus students are not seduced by it to the same extent as they might be by a Hollywood film, and are better able to recognize its flaws.

My ultimate reason for choosing to show *The Sorceress* rather than another medieval film is that despite its many flaws, I feel that, when looked at critically, it leaves the students with a truer picture of the Middle Ages than any other film I can think of. Students are quick to reject the unlikely central character of Elda, little of whom can actually be justified by medieval evidence—in fact she is a product of author Pamela Berger’s interest in herbal healing and is based on healers that she has known⁸—and most are able to assess the remaining characters and details in a balanced manner. The same might be done for many other films though. What impresses me about *The Sorceress* are the background details which the viewer often accepts unthinkingly. Berger is a medieval art historian who teaches at Boston College, and her expertise is apparent throughout the film. The visual imagery is superb, as Berger recreates numerous “snapshots” from medieval manuscript illuminations. Most impressive is the recreation of a medieval village, right down to the pattern of the wattle fence and the village church. Scenes of peasant houses, noble castles, village work, and even burials are believable, useful, and will sometimes be recognizable to medieval historians. It is this attention to detail that makes this film outstanding.

The Sorceress, or indeed any medieval film that I can think of, should never be shown to a class to illustrate what the Middle Ages were “like” or to take the place of lectures on the Inquisition or women—in fact the film distorts medieval ideas about heresy, and the main female character is almost entirely a modern fabrication with little resemblance to medieval women—but, presented in conjunction with historical evidence about the Middle Ages and discussed carefully, viewing *The Sorceress* can help students learn how to look at historical films critically, a skill that, given the omnipresence of the medium in our society, it is essential we teach our students.

8. Susan Jhirad, review in *Cinéaste* 16 (1988): 44, reprinted in *Film Review Annual* (1989): 1323-24. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41687597>.

The Sorceress and the Greyhound

Constance B. Bouchard, University of Akron

IN THE MIDDLE OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY, the Dominican friar Étienne de Bourbon, searching for Cathar heretics in southern France, stumbled upon the cult of Saint Guinefort, the holy greyhound. The greyhound, it was believed, could heal sick infants. His cult continued in force through at least the nineteenth century. This intriguing story was rediscovered by the French scholar Jean-Claude Schmitt and became the basis both of his book *The Holy Greyhound* (1983) and, a few years later, of the movie *The Sorceress*.⁹ Interestingly, the makers of the movie did not acknowledge their debt to Schmitt's work, and he only learned for the first time of the movie's existence when I told him about it at Kalamazoo in 1989.

The two modern versions of the story of Saint Guinefort, Schmitt's book and the movie, were made for two different purposes and two different audiences: the book for medieval scholars, to discuss the interrelation between medieval peasant society and the holy, and the movie to entertain a popular French audience. However, in the dozen years since it was released the movie has been promoted for a new audience: American undergraduates. After all, it is "based on" real medieval events, which gives it a specious air of authenticity. To the harried professor trying to teach too many classes of students who find reading primary sources too challenging, showing this film might seem like the perfect way to introduce the topic of medieval women and the role of medieval Christianity. But in this paper I shall discuss why, although it might be a very interesting movie to analyze in a course on modern film or even

9. Jean-Claude Schmitt, *The Holy Greyhound: Guinefort, Healer of Children Since the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Martin Thom (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

a cultural studies course on the ways that the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have reimagined the past, it would not make a suitable contribution in a medieval history course.

It is of course a lovely movie. Filmed on location in southern France, with beautiful cinematography and strong acting, it has a powerful story line about self-discovery, prejudice, and abuse of power. The producers went to a great deal of trouble to make it look medieval. The inner walls of the church are painted with murals, as is now known to have been common in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Although the castle was built at least a century later than the period in which the story is set, this is a minor anachronism. Plus, as an added bonus, the movie has absolutely no high-speed car chases or stuntmen crashing through plate glass windows.

It can probably best be considered a movie in the “fantasy” genre. Fantasy is flourishing in the United States at the end of the twentieth century, a genre that combines a vaguely medieval setting, generally mixed with some magic, with very modern characters and themes. It’s an excellent genre in its own right, but it is not medieval history, and should not be so treated. Just as we do not assign modern novels that retell the King Arthur story in our history courses (even though one might do so in a course on modern literature), we should not be showing fantasy films in those courses.

Let’s look at some of the very modern themes of the movie. Mixing French anticlericism with an American New Age interest in nature mysticism, it portrays the medieval church as harsh and hypocritical. The French Middle Ages would have been a much better place, it suggests, if the Romans had never Christianized Gaul, but rather left a wise and wholesome pagan culture in place. With a fine show of modern class consciousness, the film also suggests that male members of the medieval nobility were uniformly repressive and cruel toward their own family members and peasant tenants as well as toward their enemies. With men as the oppressors both in the church and in secular society, the women become the font of true wisdom, dignified, sensual, nurturing, and healing. Only women are clever enough to find ways to keep both babies and adult men alive in times of crises, through a knowledge, the film is quite explicit, which is passed down from one illiterate woman to

another. The film's happy ending comes about when the highly educated hero abandons all the principles on which he has built his life in order to recognize and reward unlettered female superiority.

Is this the way we want our students to think about the Middle Ages?

I'd like to look in somewhat more detail at how these themes play out. The film is fun to deconstruct, but it is compelling enough, visually and as a story, that students, as naive viewers, may not immediately pick up the very strong subtexts built into it—even if it is precisely these subtexts which they would carry away.

The story begins with the arrival in a peasant village of Étienne de Bourbon, an earnest Dominican friar. Interestingly, he is the hero of the French version of the movie, which is titled *Le Moine et la Sorcière*, or *The Monk and the Sorceress*. But in the American version, *The Sorceress* (or, as an alternate title, *The Sorceress and the Friar*), he at best gets to be the secondary hero, after the female sorceress, Elda. Almost immediately he learns of her, and the story follows his transition from suspicion of her to outright condemnation to a final understanding that she is wiser than he.

Although Étienne ostensibly arrives in the village looking for heresy, which in thirteenth-century southern France would have been Cathar dualism, this particular heresy, much less the Albigensian Crusade intended to stamp it out, never appear in the film. Instead, Étienne encounters and is troubled by what are essentially minor variants of orthodox Christianity, folklore rather than the determinedly different conception of the nature of God, creation, and salvation involved in actual heresy. The real Cathars denied the goodness of the material world, the material world that Elda celebrates as a creation of God, leaving the viewer who knows anything about medieval heresy wondering why the Dominican Étienne should be so troubled by something that sounds remarkably similar to the teachings of Saint Francis, Dominic's contemporary. It is also interesting to note that the real Étienne de Bourbon, on whose account both Schmitt's book and this movie are based, never characterized either Elda or the cult of the holy greyhound as heretical.

As well as grossly distorting the principal heresy of the thirteenth century, the film also leaves the impression that the organized church acted

as a monolithic and oppressive body, watching the rustic peasantry with the gravest suspicions. In fact, other than the excesses of the Albigensian Crusade, most of those accused of heresy in the thirteenth century were the learned, such as the counts and bishops who had adopted Catharism, or the members of the arts and theology faculties at Paris whose opinions and teachings were closely examined by other faculty members. Medieval Christianity indeed was always more concerned with whether those in positions of authority held and preached orthodoxy than with whether those under that authority had understood it properly.

In the film, however, Étienne is appalled by the peasants' joy in their festival of St. Christophe, clearly considering dourness necessary in Christianity, even though real medieval churches promoted such religious festivals. The very knowledge for which Étienne initially accuses Elda of sorcery, an understanding of the medicinal uses of leaves and flowers, is the same knowledge recorded in herbals composed at contemporary monasteries. Thus, the movie gives a very inaccurate picture of the nature of medieval heresy.

Instead, the movie suggests, real heresy, that is beliefs and practices that lead to real harm, lay not in religion but in economic and social structures. When Étienne decides to examine the villagers' beliefs, his very first informant, significantly a woman, tells him that the local count is driving peasants from their land and that this must be heretical. It would of course be astounding that, only a generation after the massacres of the Albigensian Crusades, a native of the region would not realize what the term "heresy" entailed, but the film is happy to have an ostensibly "ignorant," though in fact very "wise," woman utter what it asserts as a deep truth: that true evil is social and economic, not religious.

Although Étienne cannot initially agree, the script clearly does. The female voice goes straight to what is the only thing presented as wrong in an essentially idyllic village: the landlord is seizing peasant land to flood and create fish farms. No matter that the enclosure movement of the sixteenth century has here been pushed back three centuries in time, or that fish farming would scarcely have been economically viable in an isolated valley with no easy way to get the fish to market. More significantly, actual French landlords of the thirteenth century were

much more likely to be trying to attract peasants to their property, with such inducements as “New Towns” with their own charters and an end to obligations considered degrading, than in driving them away.

There certainly were some cruel and vicious men in positions of authority in the thirteenth century, as there have always been, but the film portrays the local count and his behavior as normal in the medieval world, without any suggestion of the mutual dependence the medieval economy fostered between landlord and worker: without the labor and the rents of his tenants, the typical lord of the thirteenth century would either have starved or been reduced to cultivating his fields in person.

The unthinking cruelty of the local count is mirrored in the cruelty of Étienne’s own noble father, seen in a flashback in the middle of the film. This father enjoyed dismaying and humiliating his son and heir by field-dressing a deer in his presence. It is of course unclear how young Étienne could have grown to his midteens, in a social group that gloried in hunting, without ever having routinely seen deer butchered, or why the process should have horrified him so much. But this youthful shame, followed by his rape of a girl whom he came upon, defenseless, is revealed by the film’s end to have been the experience that warped him into choosing to join the church.

Then Étienne has to face his sin and his shame, which he had thought well hidden, when he realizes that a young mute girl is really his daughter, the product of that rape. Having faced his past, he quickly realizes that his investigation of the woman he considered a sorceress is nothing more than a psychological quirk, due to his youthful damaging experiences. With an apparently healthy psyche now, he quickly renounces persecution of both women and heretics, rides a horse although he had sworn a holy oath never to do so again, and completes his rejection of his religious training by bribing the count to free Elda by giving him an ordinary pebble that he passes off as a holy relic. When he prepares to leave the village, he is delighted to learn that his own newly discovered daughter will stay and train with the woman he had almost had burned as a heretic. Earlier he had been dismayed to learn that the villagers were worshipping a greyhound as a saint; in his new and, the film makes clear, improved condition he decides to rebuild the shrine to Saint Guinefort which he had earlier destroyed, so that the villagers can continue to

worship the greyhound, although he confides to the old village priest that he will dedicate a statue of a human saint with a greyhound at his side, to confound any other members of the church hierarchy who may come through.

The old priest, of course, agrees. Indeed, this wise old man had clearly known all along about the holy greyhound and Elda's medicinal herbs, but had seen nothing heretical in them. It is he who suggests the ruse with the pebble purported to be a relic, naming himself an "old cheat" in the process—clearly an approved status. By film's end, the viewer is fairly sure that the reason why, at the beginning, the old priest would not let Étienne stay at his house was that he was embarrassed to have the younger man discover that his relationship with the housekeeper, who appears several times, is essentially that of an old married couple. Priests are uniformly hypocritical, the film concludes, though some hypocracies are better than others. Good priests who help their people routinely ignore the teachings of the church hierarchy, whereas earnest priests who actually believe such teachings have deep-rooted psychological problems.

While the men have troubled lives and much to conceal, the women in this movie are simple and strong. Elda too, it is revealed, had a painful experience in her midteens, being raped by yet again another evil member of the nobility, exercising what the film calls "droit de cuissage," or "first-night rights." Such "rights" of course are a myth, essentially invented in the nineteenth century, but the myth serves the film's purposes and such "rights" are thus presented, again, as normal in this period. Unlike Étienne, Elda did not become psychologically crippled by her experiences, but instead decided to study medicinal herbs and help the villagers, becoming the most important person in their society. Indeed, she learns more than herbs: she learns magic. She converses with wolves, who come to her to have thorns taken from their paws, and is always able to keep her person clean and wimple immaculately white, even though living in a remarkably crude hut. She is beautiful and dignified at all times, even when being dragged off as a prisoner. It is no wonder that the Dominican friar feels burgeoning romantic interest in her, an interest that awakens his long-buried youthful experiences.

Even though Elda is illiterate, the film presents her as free from

superstition and credulity. She knows all about the villagers' beliefs in the Holy Greyhound and manipulates these beliefs for her own purposes. She allows mothers to expose their children in the woods while they pray to Guinefort and wait for the fairies to take away false changeling babies. The reason, Elda tells Étienne, is that this superstitious behavior gives her medicinal potions the time they need to work. If wolves come, Elda orders them to leave the children alone—unless a child is sick beyond help, at which point she apparently encourages the wolves to go ahead and eat it. In this case, she assures Étienne, the mother feels better than if she merely watched her child weaken and die at home, because she knows that she has tried everything possible to save it.

Thus, Elda does not believe in Saint Guinefort, the greyhound, any more than does Étienne. Jean-Claude Schmitt's book on Guinefort focused on the ways that Christian belief can adapt to local needs and conditions. The film, in contrast, dismisses both orthodox Christianity and belief in a holy greyhound as equally superstitious and without value. Praying to any saint does not work, Elda, Étienne, and the script all agree by the end. On the other hand, while organized religion becomes in essence the "opiate of the masses," a rather vaguely defined earth-magic does work. In a world where God as a sort of Force of Nature has wise women befriend wolves, and where burying a twig while murmuring the right incantation cures warts, the church's liturgy and its saints are nothing more than window dressing, to distract the ignorant from the powerful magic-working known only to the wise.

And this powerful magic is specifically female. The film indeed celebrates the feminine, from its opening shot of a woman's breast, to the subplot of a wife keeping her captive husband alive by feeding him at her breast. But in a film that a person would like to celebrate for its strong women characters, there are some disturbing messages. The women are completely uneducated, knowing nothing of the wider world. Indeed, when Étienne complains that the village is isolated and ignorant, Elda rebukes him with the comment that there is something to be learned there every day—making it clear that wise women should not try to expand their horizons. The women, other than Elda, are almost entirely concerned with their infants—even the noble countess is. Women serve the men food and drink—even Elda offers Étienne a dipper when he

drinks from a spring. The women are even portrayed barefoot. Étienne is barefoot as well—at least until he takes up horseback riding again—but then he also wears what is essentially a dress. The film thus, while superficially feminist in approach, ends up celebrating not women in general, but specifically women who are “barefoot, pregnant, and in the kitchen.”

Given all these issues so artfully embedded in the film, it is very difficult to recommend it for classroom use. In part its very effectiveness as a fantasy film, the compelling nature of its acting, cinematography, and plot line, make it a bigger barrier to learning about the real Middle Ages than a weaker film would be. Perhaps one might argue that one could first show the film and then discuss the anachronisms and inaccuracies in its characterization of medieval religion and society. But here one has the danger that, especially for students shaped by modern visual culture, the visual image may be much more powerful and enduring than one’s words. And in any event, why would one want to first spend an hour and a half showing a movie, and then probably an equal amount of time debunking it, and thus spend an entire week’s worth of classes ending up where one started, without having imparted any new knowledge about women and religion in the Middle Ages?

When this movie first came out and I recognized from the opening sequence that it had drawn on Schmitt’s study, I hoped that at last I might have found a movie about the Middle Ages I could countenance showing to my students. A dozen years later, I am still waiting for such a film.

Under the Spell of *The Sorceress*:
The Allure of the Medieval
Mary A. Suydam, Kenyon College

IT IS PARTICULARLY FITTING THAT THE MOVIE *The Sorceress* is filmed in black and white, for it presents us with a stark Jungian tableau: a clash of masculine-feminine opposites ending with a peculiar kind of harmony and resolution.¹⁰ On the one side, Stephen of Bourbon is the Jungian animus, the representative of masculinity, patriarchal dominance, learned culture, literacy, law, truth, authority, and, incidentally, anger and hostility. On the other side is Elda, the anima, the “sorceress” who represents femininity, peasant submission, folk and oral culture, nature, intuition, superstition, and, incidentally, love, joy and acceptance. Of course, this clash of opposites is an unequal contest, because Stephen holds all the cards—at one point in the film, he angrily exclaims to Elda “I have nothing to learn here!” Consequently, their integration can be partial at best. Nevertheless, as with any evocation of powerful archetypes, the film has the ability to move audiences deeply. Aside from the emotional appeal, medievalists have to ask: is the film useful as a depiction of the Middle Ages? And what does the film gain by situating itself within a medieval milieu?

The film is loosely based upon Jean-Claude Schmitt’s *The Holy Greyhound* (1979), which analyzes a thirteenth-century exemplum told by

10. William S. Sahakian, ed., *Psychology of Personality: Readings in Theory* (New York: Rand-McNally, 1974), 59-63. Reprinted from Carl Jung, “The Syzygy: Anima and Animus” and “Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious” in *Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self*, vol. 9, pt. 2 of *The Collected Works of Carl G. Jung* (New York: Routledge, 1959).

Stephen of Bourbon himself.¹¹ Stephen relates that during his career as Dominican preacher and inquisitor, he stumbled upon a group of peasants who brought their sick children to a sacred grove. There, they performed a rite in which they invoked St. Guinefort, a dog, now venerated as a saint, mistakenly killed by a nobleman while protecting the nobleman's child from a snake. Stephen ordered the sacred grove cut down and forbade the peasants to gather there, and thus successfully suppressed (so he thought) both cult and rite. However, Schmitt provides evidence for the survival of both legend and cult until about 1940!

Thus, one obvious reason for the medieval setting is that the story is itself medieval. However, the survival of the rite until nearly the present day means that the filmmakers did indeed have ample latitude to set the film in any historical setting from the thirteenth through the nineteenth century. Indeed, Schmitt even provides early nineteenth-century examples of clerical hostility to the Guinefort cult which are very similar to the opposition described by Stephen of Bourbon. But only in the medieval period did the potent combination of the clerical, the masculine, and law enforcement in the persons of Dominican inquisitors assume its distinctive shape. By the nineteenth century the Church could cajole but not compel. *The Sorceress* should compel us to ask: was it indeed in the Middle Ages that animus and anima also collided, and with what consequences for the ages that have followed? Did European culture gain or lose its soul? Are these the types of questions we and our students benefit most from in understanding the Middle Ages?

A sense of the collision of opposites also intrigued Jean-Claude Schmitt. In his introduction he writes: “[t]he opposition of these two cultures [learned and literate vs. oral and vernacular] would seem to me to have been one of the most important features of feudal society. Their relationship was a complex one, shifting between mutual incomprehension and overt hostility, but without there ever being a complete cessation of the exchange that such conflicts often fostered” (Schmitt, 1). However, Schmitt does not equate literate culture with masculinity

11. Jean-Claude Schmitt, *The Holy Greyhound: Guinefort, Healer of Children Since the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

and vernacular culture with femininity in quite the way that the film's personifications do.

As a historian I do not believe that art should seek “the most historical” representation in order to construct its own truth, nor do I believe that there is some hard-and-fast line between “history” and “myth.” Indeed, I believe that King Arthur is in some ways more “real” than William the Conqueror. Thus I am not necessarily opposed to films that reconstruct historical events in “ahistorical” ways.¹² But I do believe that our view of the Middle Ages is generally conditioned by the values we valorize—or reject—for our own age, and that we need to be conscious of this process. As a culture we need the Middle Ages because it is always the shadowy other against which we measure ourselves. If we see ourselves as the products of scientific thinking, we look back and down upon the Middle Ages as the repository of dogmatism, blind obedience, and superstition, culminating in both the horrors of the Inquisition and the bumbling idiocy of Monty Pythonesque peasants. In other words, we dislike both Stephen and Elda as representatives of an earlier, more childish era we would like to forget. If, on the other hand, we lament the cold efficiency of modernism, we yearn for Elda's anima and the warmth of its ancient folk wisdom, and despise Stephen for the losses caused by his repression of a culture steeped in nature's presence. Alternately, we may see Stephen as trying (in rather heavy-handed fashion, to be sure) to free the peasants from the grip of irrationality and, in his own words, “superstition” (the rite, after all, often results in children's deaths, and I doubt most of us would submit our own children to it). Thus our approach—and that of the filmmakers—to the medieval past is in part fashioned by our response to our own age. Hence, the theoretical construction of binary cultures such as animus and anima is not value-free.

The filmmakers' sympathies clearly lie with Elda. Unlike the crone of Stephen's exemplum, she is portrayed as young and beautiful (but taught by “the old one”). Although a peasant, she is free from peasant superstitions such as the belief in wood sprites who steal healthy babies. But unlike Stephen, she does not oppose such beliefs, adopting a policy

12. A recent example of a successful integration between fiction, history, and literature in my view is *Shakespeare In Love*.

of “going with” peasant beliefs in order to practice her healing arts.¹³ She hints that she uses herbal remedies to protect the children submitted to the rite from fire and wolves. Strangely, both she and Stephen are aloof from the class conflict that is also depicted in the film (the lord is flooding fertile fields to create a fish pond; one peasant drains the dike in an attempt to sabotage the lord’s design). She willingly aids the lord’s wife in a difficult birth, just as she would help peasant women in similar circumstances.

Stephen, on the other hand, is portrayed in the film as vengeful, dogmatic, and a rapist to boot (just as he violates peasant cultural practices). Although a momentary twinge of guilt causes him to release Elda, he learns nothing of lasting influence from their encounter. The village priest, the only character who stands between both worlds, notes that Stephen will someday tell the story, “building it into a vast treatise, parts within parts . . . [but] men will never know what really happened here.” That is, men (and hopefully women too) will never know the true story from Stephen’s account. By implication, the filmmakers represent their interpretation as the true story just now being told.

Stephen is, however, successful in destroying the sacred grove, and, he thinks, in re-presenting Guinefort as a man “with a dog by his side.” Thus the filmmakers conclude with a world in which the repressive dominant culture, although still omnipresent, has been softened by the continuing muted presence of the marginalized, itself freed from the excesses of its own past in which helpless children were exposed to the forces of nature in the raw.

Schmitt’s (1979) book has a different take. Although Schmitt also constructs two binary cultures, he sees them as linked together throughout the ages in a discomfiting Derridean dance.¹⁴ Without the folk

13. Ronald Grimes uses the theatrical term “going with” to indicate a method of personal interaction that is neither tolerant (but distanced), imitative, nor overpowering. Ronald Grimes, *Beginnings in Ritual Studies* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 19–20.

14. Schmitt himself does not cite Derrida. But the mutual need of binaries for definition, and the constant slippage of definitions, is part of the current arguments in both structuralist and post-structuralist traditions. In classical structuralism, a word (chair) stands for a thing (a chair) which is absent. The

culture, learned culture could not differentiate itself. Stephen of Bourbon is the perfect demonstration of this: a learned man who spent his life tramping about the countryside preaching to peasants and ferreting out beliefs that contrasted to his own. And the folk culture is itself constituted in a thoroughly Christian milieu. Guinefort may be a dog, but he is also a saint, and the Christian cult of saints, relics, and the “treasury of merits” inform all practices relating to him. To Schmitt, the most compelling evidence of mutual need is the fact that the folk rites involving Guinefort lasted precisely as long as did orthodox Christianity in rural France:

Stephen of Bourbon . . . thought he had suppressed the pilgrimage to St. Guinefort’s wood, but this was not the case. . . . The cult was quite impervious to such attacks, and in fact lasted as long as the folk culture itself, its long life being attributable to the structural permanence of an ideological system in which folklore played an essential, albeit secondary, role. The clerical and folk cultures thus disappeared together. . . . There was no conqueror, but two conquered parties instead. The free thinkers and folklorists took the place of priests (Schmitt, 177-78).

The filmmakers themselves provide unwitting evidence for Schmitt’s theory. Stephen’s Guinefort exemplum is from his treatise “On the Seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit,” and illustrates the sin of “superstition,” which is the sixth of the seven sins of “social pride.” The seventh sin of social pride, “heresy,” is dealt with in a subsequent chapter, indicating that Stephen did not see the Guinefort rite as heretical. According to

thing itself is never produced but continually deferred: “Each sign derives its meaning from all the other signs in its language chain.” Chris Weedon, *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994), 23. Further, definition requires difference—a word is not something else. Thus what a thing is bound up with what it is not. Derrida focuses upon the desire for a center in a language system that would fix meanings once and for all, as well as the impossibility of discovering such a center. See Jacques Derrida, “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences,” in *Writing and Difference*, tr. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 278-93.

Stephen's own account, he dealt leniently with the rite's practitioners, merely forbidding them to visit Guinefort's wood. No one was prosecuted for "superstition," because, according to prevailing Dominican theology, superstition was considered trickery of diabolic origin but not necessarily malefic or harmful. Consequently, superstition's human practitioners, being gullible and duped, had no culpability. It was not until the end of the Middle Ages that such devilish trickery was redefined as the diabolical ability to cause harm, which paved the way for massive witch persecutions.¹⁵

Yet in the film Stephen accuses Elda of heresy. Indeed, she is turned over to the local lord and nearly executed until Stephen's last-minute pangs of guilt save her. I believe the film chooses to equate Elda's sin with "heresy" because "superstition" is now associated in the minds of many educated modern audiences with religion in general and specifically with the Catholic church itself. Schmitt cites a nineteenth century description of practices in Lyons: "[w]ere I to write a history of superstition in the *département* . . . on the one side I should range all those superstitions that are of a religious nature; on the other I should place all those that are not of such a nature . . . including belief in witches, the use of formulas and cabalistic signs. . . . I should subdivide the second, studying first those superstitions which may be confused with catholic beliefs, and then purely idolatrous beliefs."¹⁶ For Stephen to accuse Elda of a "superstition" would be truer to historical fact but it no longer has dramatic power.

This brings me back to the main question: how useful is the film for teaching students about the Middle Ages? Although I think that the film, as well as Schmitt's book, is necessarily as concerned with modern conceits as with the allure of the medieval, that does not necessarily disqualify it as a form of pedagogy. And the film is generally respectful in depicting the rhythms of peasant life, which do not depend upon

15. See Alan Kors and Edward Peters, *Witchcraft in Europe, 1100–1700: A Documentary History* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972), and Jeffrey Burton Russell, *A History of Witchcraft: Sorcerers, Heretics, and Pagans* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1983).

16. A. Vayssière, quoted in Schmitt, 136.

the presence of Elda or Stephen. I will leave aside the appalling inclusion of “the lord’s first night rights” canard as a regrettable lapse on the filmmakers’ parts.

Was there a dominant culture that was essentially masculine, literate, and clerical? Absolutely. Was there a marginalized culture of the feminine, the vernacular, and the peasantry? Here things get more murky; the separation of such cultures into the stark blacks and whites of the film make me uneasy. The difficulty is that such Jungian archetypes (as Jung himself noted) are so powerful and natural in our thinking. In teaching courses on marginalized medieval cultures, I have found that beginning and advanced students alike invariably begin by assuming that the representatives of the Catholic church were masculine, dogmatic, and repressive, as indeed many of them proved to be. This film plays right into those assumptions, and, as such, contributes to the continued marginalization of cultures that many students—and the filmmakers—clearly admire. The concept of marginalization upholds dominance. After all, if there is a dominant culture, it is clearly differentiated from something and thus exclusive. Marginalization is a strategy of a clerical, elite group and not necessarily a fact. In this case, it is the way this group tried to project—and protect—their own vision of themselves as separate from and dominant over others.

As an example of this strategy from the area I study, women’s visionary cultures, consider the fact that most surviving women’s visionary texts were carefully written, preserved, and read by men from elite, clerical cultures. Does this mean that we have texts from only those women who were accepted by this dominant culture, or from those who somehow managed to conceal their subversiveness? I think the assumption that literate men could not appreciate the contributions of women is insulting to the women themselves, to the communities who valued them, to the monks who cherished their writings, and to the many audiences who sought out and witnessed their visionary raptures. As I have written elsewhere, the presence of these multiple audiences suggest the importance of visionary culture to medieval culture as a whole—not as a separate, or even secondary, but as an integral aspect of medieval culture.¹⁷

17. Mary A. Suydam, “Beguine Textuality: Sacred Performance,” in Mary

And here also is where I part company with the Jungian tableau offered by *The Sorceress*. Binary categories are in fact part of the construction of language, but I think it is important for us to resist those binaries, to envision the more complicated notion of power stated by Foucault: “Truth isn’t outside power, or lacking in power. . . . Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint.”¹⁸ That is, in this case, power is not a dominant force against which marginalized truth struggles.

To summarize, in the thirteenth century Stephen of Bourbon constructed a narrative in which the culture valuable to him repressed and devalued, but did not ignore, cultures valuable to others. His narrative was a hegemonic strategy, not historical fact, as the continued existence of Guinefort’s cult demonstrates. Strangely, although the filmmakers clearly don’t like Stephen, they have accepted and embellished his narrative of two cultures in confrontation. To the extent that we continue to see medieval culture as primarily masculine, dominant, and learned, with a secondary (to use Schmitt’s term) but largely excluded folk culture, Stephen has been successful.

And this is why I choose not to use this film in my courses. Not because it isn’t “historical,” and not because the filmmakers have recast Elda from a crone to a beautiful woman and Stephen from an obscure Dominican to a scion of nobility (in fact, there’s every reason to assume that Stephen’s construction of the woman as “crone” may be part of his narrative strategy). No, I resist this film because it creates such images of powerful binary cultures in collision that are so in synchrony with modern beliefs and longings about the medieval that as a teacher I find them very difficult to overcome.

Looking at the Guinefort exemplum and cult, what would provide a starting point for the complex medieval relationships I construct, in which learned men did not necessarily patronize folk culture? Schmitt

A. Suydam and Joanna E. Ziegler, eds., *Performance and Transformation: New Approaches to Late Medieval Spirituality* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1999), 169–210.

18. Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*, ed. and trans. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 131.

relates the suggestive associations of dogs with saints whose festivals are celebrated in late July and August, the period of the dog star. Foremost among these is St. Christopher (July 25), who is often depicted in medieval manuscripts (presumably drawn by educated monks) with a dog's head. Or St. Dominic himself (August 4), whose name inspired the pun "domini canes" (hounds of God) and of whom other monks told the story that, before his birth, Dominic's mother saw herself in a dream nursing a dog at her breast.¹⁹ According to my own research on visionary beguines, another Dominican from the same period, Thomas of Cantimpré, so admired the holy woman Lutgard of Aywières that he asked her permission to cut off her little finger (after death, of course) to treasure as a relic.²⁰ Here a learned Dominican so revered an unlettered Flemish holy woman that he considered her a living saint.

In these exempla, folk and learned culture did not encounter each other, nor were they separate worlds; rather, together they constructed a whole culture within which both the living and the dying functioned. Even though students and teachers come to medieval courses governed by the modern romantic allure or repulsion of the medieval, in the end I want my students to study that whole culture with all its ambiguities, allegiances, and animosities.

19. Schmitt, *Holy Greyhound*, 149-52.

20. Martinus Cawley, trans., *Lives of Ida of Nivelles, Lutgard, and Alice the Leper* (Lafayette, OR: Guadalupe Translations, 1987).

The Sorceress as an Interpretive Tool in Medieval History Classes

Lisa M. Bitel, University of Kansas

THE CRUCIAL MOMENT FOR BUDDING HISTORIANS in the film *The Sorceress* (*Le moine et la sorcière*, 1987) by Suzanne Schiffman aided by Pamela Berger, is when the inquisitor, Étienne de Bourbon, casts himself on the ground in despair. The camera draws up and away from the monk, forcing the modern viewer to look down upon this zealous persecutor of religious dissidents and decent peasants, who lies moaning on the cold floor of a little country church. Étienne, as viewers know, is himself a repentant rapist. The details of the monk's appearance, the church, the conversation that has preceded the emotional scene all seem gritty and realistic, not glitzy and anachronistic. But the director's motive is Freudian and the camera work not subtle, aimed at distancing modern viewers from the friar. It is exactly that distance granted the audience that makes this movie so useful in the classroom.

Historians began to grasp the pedagogical use of film some years ago, even before Charlton Heston debuted at the American Historical Association convention in a forum with Oliver Stone. The *American Historical Review* regularly enjoins historians to contribute essays on film as a historiographical medium, while its news organ, *Perspectives*, carries a regular column called "Film and Media." Historians have acted as consultants to major films and television projects—who does not envy Natalie Zemon Davis's collaboration with Gerard Depardieu in the creation of *The Return of Martin Guerre*?—and have even begun to theorize about film and its uses as a historiographical medium. Debates over the accuracy of historical information delivered by film, and about the possible uses of film by historians, have been simmering for years.

Many of us have introduced film into our classrooms as teaching

tools, as well as for entertainment and an occasional lecture off. This is easier for modernists, of course, who can use movies as primary source evidence. Students are savvy enough to know when a film about the present offers an interpretation of reality that differs from their own, even if they do need help deciphering film's artistic and political agendas. But how can medieval feminists use film? Robert Rosenstone has suggested ways in his edited book *Revisioning History: Film and the Construction of a New Past* (Princeton, 1995) and in other publications, including the most recent issue of *Perspectives* (November, 1999). As Rosenstone puts it, arguments about the accuracy of information in a film are beside the point. At the heart of history on film are interpretive acts of "compression, condensation, alteration, metaphor" (21) that allow not only the creation of art and entertainment that is film, but also the realization of other voices and larger truths that history books and lectures can only suggest and sometimes even fear to address. Hence, *The Sorceress*, for instance, compresses the institutions of Christianity, condenses the long history of Christianization, alters the perspective of the viewer—from that of winners to that of losers—and through the metaphors of its female characters, allow us to see medieval Europe from the lost perspective of women. What is more, *The Sorceress* does all this in a way that media-savvy undergraduates can readily absorb.

The film tells several stories at once. One is the introductory tale of a local lord who mistakenly killed the dog that saved his baby; that dog became honored as a local deity and saint in charge of protecting other babies. (This story was also told by Jean Claude Schmitt in his 1979 work, *Le saint lévrier: Guinefort, géurisseur d'enfants depuis le XIIIe siècle.*) Another tale concerns a later lord (one assumes a descendant of the first) who oppresses his peasants and the peasants' subversion in response. This story forms the background for the main action. The third and most explicit tale is of a forest woman named Elda who heals with simple remedies, abets the peasants in their heretical worship of the dog-saint, and wishes to learn to read. And the last is the psychological detective story of Étienne de Bourbon, the historical figure who actually produced an inquisitor's report of the peasants and their dog-grave in a sacred grove, and whose flashback past eventually explains his actions in the film.

None of these stories comes straight from either the filmmaker's studio or from the medieval documents. There was an Étienne de Bourbon who wrote a report which we can all read, but he never mentioned a contest of faith (with erotic undertones) against any Elda. Some of the structures of daily life depicted in the film seem accurate. The floors are of mud, the food rough and untasty-looking, the peasants sullen and naive in the face of authority. We know from charters and laws that tenants broke dams and committed other sabotage when their lords raised taxes or evicted them. We know also that they improvised on Christian practice with the support of local village priests. There are no obvious historical clinkers of the *Camelot* or *The Vikings* variety here: no zippers, no spandex, no living-room sized jousting fields, no 1960s haircuts. Rosenstone declares that film "is a lousy medium for delivering facts," but in fact, *The Sorceress* does pretty well.

However, what students of medieval history and women's history immediately notice when viewing the film is the distance between our perspectives and that of its main male characters, the friar and the lord. By juxtaposing the stories of Elda and the peasants with those about the lord and the friar-inquisitor, the film leaps out of the realm of history and into the imagination. By the time my students see this movie, they have been reading primary sources for six weeks, and they know that no forest woman or peasant left any accounts of their own spiritualities, their daily lives, or their feelings about the religious and political authorities of their world. What is more, even though they are sympathetic to Elda, students recognize from the start—their titters give them away—that her character is anachronistic and even New Age-y. The character is independent and unruffled by the religious and sexual persecution of the friar concerned primarily for the women and children of her community, like some modern-day social worker; attuned to the moon, the beasts, the plants, and the cycle of birth, death, and rebirth; plus, she lives happily by herself in the woods. Students know that no woman moved freely through the woods in medieval France, let alone accompanied constantly by music, as Elda does. But they also catch on that Elda represents the voices of ordinary women, who did not write about their religion. With coaxing, they can also understand that Elda stands for a style of Christianity associated in the Middle Ages

with women and heretics and that turns up only indirectly in primary source documents. Finally, they laugh about the sexual undertone to the friar's persecution of Elda, but can derive from it the general message of misogyny that pervades many ecclesiastical sources.

For several reasons, students are astute enough to interpret the film's messages, catch the film's "errors," and understand that they are viewing an interpretation. For one, by the time they see *The Sorceress* they have usually seen many worse medieval-themed films in my courses. I begin my all surveys of medieval history with a film-illustrated lecture on "What the Middle Ages Wasn't." I show clips from costume dramas of the 1930s to the 1950s (such as Errol Flynn's *The Adventures of Robin Hood*, 1938) to remind them how history on film and in novels used to be just the setting for a good romance or adventure. We watch an early scene in *The Vikings* (1958) in which (1) Kirk Douglas wears what looks like a shag carpet as a vest over his bare chest, (2) Tony Curtis plays an Anglo-Saxon prince-slave with a Brooklyn accent, (3) the Vikings play a game of axe-throwing, where they compete to chop the braids off the head of a woman, and (4) everybody scoops greenish beer out of a giant vat and eats without cutlery. Students get the point made by non-historian filmmakers: this was a barbaric age and not very good for women.

The next films educate them to more sophisticated viewing. *Braveheart* (1995) and Kenneth Branagh's *Henry V* (1989) are both less crude in their presentation of the past, and both use an imagined medieval past to make a modern political statement. One of these films is just old-fashioned costume drama in new clothes; *Braveheart* and its message of individualism and political nationalism is as hokey as any epic from previous decades. But *Henry V* uses a sixteenth-century script of a fourteenth-century story to revise the big ideas of history, pose new questions about the past, and investigate issues that neither the primary sources nor the secondary literature of professional historians satisfactorily considers: the costs of nationalism, tribalism, and war. Even students realize, when faced with clips from these two films, that the Branagh-Shakespeare collaboration makes a more complex statement. Its narrator dressed in modern clothing and speaking directly to the viewers forces them to realize that what the film presents—and

what Shakespeare wrote—was a play, now cast on film. The fact that the characters speak in poetry, while suffering the mud and blood of battle scenes, helps student viewers challenge the areality of movie pasts.

Finally, as Rosenstone suggests, I show the students two films that help them to reject the traditional teleology of historical narrative and juxtapose the past and present, to understand that every story of the past is just that—a story, whether on film, on the written page, or coming from the mouth of a professor in lecture. *The Navigator: A Medieval Odyssey* (1988) and *Monty Python and the Holy Grail* (1975) both deconstruct the traditional story of the Middle Ages. *The Navigator* contrasts full-color scenes of medieval people transported to the modern world with black-and-white scenes of the “real lives” of the medieval protagonists of the film. In short, the boy-hero dreams the twentieth century. This simple technique forces viewers to ask: which is reality and which is fiction? *Monty Python* with its purposefully silly anachronisms (especially the ending of the film that collapses the modern perspective of the audience with the Arthurian tales it tells in a free-for-all of knights versus coppers) emphasizes the creative act that produces medieval history. King Arthur, who may never have existed, talks foolish king-talk and only pretends to ride a horse (“he’s got two halves of coconuts and he’s beatin’ ‘em together”), but we know he is a real king because “he hasn’t got shit all over him.”

By the time students come to *The Sorceress*, then, they have already been exposed to the concepts of multiple realities and multiple historical authorities that these films pose. Of course, students already had a whole toolbox full of critical skills gained from a young lifetime of movie-, television-, and video-viewing. They may not be able to tell good history from bad when they arrive at my classroom, but they know a decent film when they see it. They are sensitive to their manipulation by visual media to a degree that the current generation of professional historians has taken much longer to achieve. Students feel free to criticize not only the accuracy of film depictions of the past, but also the point of view of films, when they cannot yet approach written texts. Students faced with their first barbarian law codes often sink into despair at the language, the legal concepts, and the authoritative voice of the texts; they have no tools with which to criticize such exotic material. Medieval theology is

undecipherable to a beginning historian in a way that *The Sorceress* is not. Even the rousing stories from the medieval past—*Beowulf*, *Le chanson de Roland*, *The Táin*—while amusing, are too exotic for undergraduates to place in context until they have developed the ability to compare the information and purpose of the texts with other kinds of evidence.

Films give students the confidence to apply critical skills to the texts, both primary and secondary. By the time my students have viewed *The Sorceress*, they are more than ready to critique its position on women, female spirituality, peasant subversion, and historians' imposition of Freudian motives upon the past. After watching *The Sorceress* and worse films they can return to written interpretations of the past ready to judge. And, once they realize that historians practice interpretation, just as filmmakers do, students can move on to their own interpretation of the evidence.

Of course, with all their savvy and interpretive skills, many of my students end up critiquing my choice of films to show in class. By the time my class on the History of Women in Premodern Europe gets to the Reformation and Ken Russell's *The Devils*, they have learned enough to reject that deplorable piece of cinematic evidence.

Film, Women and History

Jacqueline Jenkins, University of Calgary

THERE IS A REMARKABLE CORRESPONDENCE between serious history and fiction film when it comes to medieval women's narratives: the latter can rarely be found in mainstream or traditional examples of either. In both cases, that is history and film, readers interested in women's stories specifically recognize the need to look to the margins—noncanonical literary documents and/or independent filmmaking—for fuller representations of women's lives. Thus, medieval cultural historians have for some time now moved beyond traditional accounts of medieval history and canonical literary sites to alternate sources for their constructions of women's histories—for instance, religious writing (even, or especially, when unorthodox), saints' lives, testamentary documents, convent records, biographies.²¹

21. See for instance the essays in *Medieval Women and the Sources of Medieval History*, ed. Joel T. Rosenthal (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990); Susan Mosher Stuard, ed., *Women in Medieval History and Historiography* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987) or Susan Mosher Stuard, ed. *Women in Medieval Society* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1976); Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski, eds., *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986); and Bonnie S. Anderson and Judith P. Zinsser, *A History of Their Own: Women in Europe from Prehistory to the Present* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988). Or consider any of the new collections of essays on medieval sexualities and social relationships which document women's roles and histories in medieval society: for instance, Cathy Jorgensen Itnyre, ed., *Medieval Family Roles* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1996); Vern L. Bullough and James A. Brundage, eds., *Handbook of Medieval Sexuality* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1996); and Jacqueline Murray and Konrad Eisenbichler, eds., *Desire and Discipline: Sex and Sexuality in the Premodern West* (Toronto: University of Toronto

Concurrent with the increasing interest in the history of medieval women's lives and social roles in our critical communities, the media has reflected a growing awareness of feminist issues generally, though not always with the same excitement and acceptance (cf. Susan Faludi's description of this backlash to feminism in her book of that title²²). And almost coincidentally, popular culture, but specifically the film industry, has furthermore displayed a renewed interest in the (mostly English) Middle Ages in the last decade or so, resulting in numerous film versions of medieval stories from various industry sources: the larger studios, independent directors, and television producers have all offered medieval fare with a large variety of celebrity names in the casts.²³ This convergence of interests has not, however, meant that the more recent, often very large-budget, mainstream attempts to represent the Middle Ages feature women's stories; rather, the new films, while exploiting contemporary culture's apparent love affair with strong, independent women, still, disappointingly, manage to cast the female characters within the larger contexts of men's stories, or within familiar heteronormative stories common to film generally. In other words, though appearing to respond to increased pressure to provide stronger roles for women (from both

Press, 1996). This is by no means a comprehensive list of the recent studies in women's medieval history, but rather a happy indication of the breadth and scope of research undertaken.

22. Susan Faludi, *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1991), especially "The Backlash in Popular Culture" (75-226).

23. For instance, this decade alone has witnessed the release of such films as *The Fisher King* (dir. Terry Gilliam, 1991), *Robin Hood: Prince of Thieves* (dir. Kevin Reynolds, 1991), *Robin Hood* (dir. John Irvin, 1991), *The Anchoress* (dir. Chris Newby, 1993), *The Advocate* (dir. Leslie Megahey, 1994), *Braveheart* (dir. Mel Gibson, 1995), *A Kid in King Arthur's Court* (dir. Michael Gottlieb, 1995), *First Knight* (dir. Jerry Zucker, 1995), *Dragonheart* (dir. Rob Cohen, 1996) as well as such made-for-TV fare as *A Young Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* (dir. R. L. Thomas, 1995), Lifetime's Romance Theatre's version of *Guinevere* (producers Les Alexander and Don Enright, 1995), *Four Diamonds* (dir. Peter Werner, 1995) and the recently released A&E version of *Ivanhoe* (dir. Clive Tickner, 1997).

within and outside the industry), the large studios have yet to produce a mainstream “medieval film” which focuses around a female character or a specifically female story. (In my opinion, they have yet to produce a film at all, medieval or otherwise, which focuses around such a female character or story, free from the heteronormative or heterosexist ideologies so persuasive still in popular culture.)

For example, the new Hollywood “medieval films”—*Robin Hood: Prince of Thieves* (dir. Kevin Reynolds, 1991), *Braveheart* (dir. Mel Gibson, 1995), *First Knight* (dir. Jerry Zucker, 1995), and *Dragonheart* (dir. Rob Cohen, 1996)—seem, at first glance, to take a progressive stand with regard to women in their narratives. Each of these four films appears to include at least one, more fully developed, female role; this role is occasionally an expansion of an existing traditional character (as in *First Knight*’s Guinevere played by Julia Ormond), but more often involves a new character invented for the new narrative (for instance, Little John’s wife in *Robin Hood*). In each case, however, the strong, intelligent female character is completely subordinated to the male-driven narrative by the end of the film, thereby revealing the ideological position of the mainstream film industry. In some cases, she is simply dead, killed off in the narrative precisely for her independence and intelligence, as in Mel Gibson’s *Braveheart*, where a strong woman is more palatable when she is only a ghostly memory. The addition of the strong female roles reflects the pressure the studios feel to respond positively (and publicly) to feminism, but the subordination and the corresponding disempowerment of the women in the stories project a louder statement on the industry’s politics.

Two significant examples of this ideological flip-flop occur in *First Knight* and *Dragonheart*. Each film, at the beginning, introduces a strong female character central to the narrative whose position is ultimately subordinated to the specifically masculine concerns of victory in battle, patriarchal inheritance and authority, and sexual competition.²⁴ For

24. For a fuller discussion of gender in these films, see my two recent articles: “The Aging of the King: Arthur and America in *First Knight*,” in *King Arthur’s Modern Return*, ed. D. Mancoff (New York: Garland Publishing, 1998) 199–212; and “First Knights and Common Men: Masculinity in

instance, *First Knight's* Guinevere begins the film active and strong (we first see her playing soccer), able to resist an aggressive physical attack (she leaps from a moving coach in self-defense), quick thinking (she rips her dress to leave directions when captured by Malagant's men), determined and independent in spirit (she chooses to love Arthur rather than simply be married for politics). She is presented to the viewer as equal to Arthur in every significant way: in spirit, in will, in ability to rule. Nevertheless, by the end of the film, her character is secondary to the central conflict between Lancelot and Malagant for Arthur's throne, and she becomes little more than the literal symbol of the transference of power between the old ruler and the new: Lancelot receives Guinevere directly from Arthur on his deathbed as part of a parcel with his sword and the kingdom. Similarly, *Dragonheart's* Kara (Dina Meyer) begins the film fighting and agitating in her village for political and physical resistance to the rule of the old king, and later his son, Einon (David Thewles). She soon becomes the object of Einon's desire, and then, like Guinevere, comes to symbolize the conflict between Einon and his tutor Bowen (Dennis Quaid) for the rule of the kingdom. And finally, for no really clear narrative reason, Bowen (a recovering dragonslayer) is given both Kara and the kingdom at the end of the film.

I do not mean to suggest that these films—popular medieval or historical films generally, that is—actually provide accurate representations of men's histories, either, though they do nevertheless portray historical men (or legendary men) in historical settings and at the center of interesting and complex narratives.²⁵ These same films, I would argue, do their female characters (and viewers) a more substantial though insidious injustice: when they do portray women, the films do little more than gesture at women's narratives, depicting female characters solely in the context of the men's narratives. The female characters the films

American Arthurian Film," in *King Arthur on Film: New Essays on Arthurian Cinema*, ed. Kevin J. Harty (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1999).

25. However, it is not always clear where fiction and fact end in the mind of contemporary viewers—the male characters and the events portrayed in the films, while not strictly historical, nevertheless reflect popular beliefs about the Middle Ages. Consider, for instance, most medieval/historical re-enactment events.

introduce are strong and independent initially, but not for long. These characters appeal on one level to film audiences' changing expectations about women and their roles in both contemporary and medieval society, but under sustained analysis, reveal only a disappointing tokenism. Even the romantic conclusion common to medieval films confirms the tokenism at work: the heterosexual commitment of the ending results in the complete objectification of the main female character. This objectification is common to heteronormative society, perhaps, but is nevertheless at odds with the apparent gender equality of the characters at the film's beginning.

So what can contemporary viewers of these films hope for? Well, one obvious, and familiar, way of dealing with the disparity between depictions of women in popular culture and the realities of women's histories/experiences is for women themselves to attempt to (re-)tell the stories. Christine de Pizan (1365-ca.1430) provides one of the earliest examples of such a response. She revised the history of women as she knew it after confronting unrelentingly negative portrayals of women in the moral and didactic texts of her age. Her description of her awakening to the discrepancies between the accepted images of women and her own experiences of women's lives provides the preface to and the explanation for *The Book of the City of Ladies*:

I started to read [this book by Mathéolus] and went on for a little while. Because the subject seemed to me not very pleasant for people who do not enjoy lies, and of no use in developing virtue or manners, . . . I put it down in order to turn my attention to more elevated and useful study. But just the sight of this book, even though it was of no authority, made me wonder how it happened that so many different men—and learned men among them—have been and are so inclined to express both in speaking and in their treatises and writings so many wicked insults about women and their behaviour. (1.1.1)²⁶

26. Christine de Pizan, *The Book of the City of Ladies*, trans. Earl Jeffrey Richards (Persea Books, 1982), 3-4.

Several contemporary women filmmakers and writers have responded to the distressing lack of (or mis-) representations of women in recent medieval-era narratives by employing strategies similar to that of Christine de Pizan. For instance, Laurel Phelan claimed the authority of self-hypnosis and past-life regression for her 1996 “autobiography” of *Guinevere*.²⁷ Like Christine de Pizan, Phelan, in her introduction, relies on supernatural justifications for her account—in her case, recurring nighttime dream-visions rather than heavenly visitations. Both of these carefully crafted frame-narratives, however, function to direct the reader’s attention away from the woman writer’s intentional act of redressing perceived inaccuracies or omissions. In Christine de Pizan’s case, such strategies are the protection of the medieval woman writer in the face of a thoroughly established male resistance to women’s intellectual activity. But, as Phelan herself states of previous histories:

All of the information in this book has been received solely through my past life regressions. . . . I still refuse to read any other material, as I feel it is not the truth but rather passed-on information that has become distorted and greatly embellished over the centuries (8).

Similarly, Pamela Berger cited her commitment to representing the overlooked histories of medieval women as the impetus for the creation of *Le moine et la sorcière* (*The Sorceress*, dir. Suzanne Schiffman, 1988). Like Phelan, whose account is quite deliberately not based in any historical source (no matter how loosely defined), Berger, screenwriter and coproducer of the film, acknowledged that though the central conflict in the film’s narrative between the wandering monk and the healer woman comes from the monk’s own account, the sorceress “came from what I imagined she would say as a healer, from the things we know she did, such as tend the sick, and from my own research into women healers.”²⁸

27. Laurel Phelan, *Guinevere* (New York: Pocket Books, 1996). The subtitle reads “The True Story of One Woman’s Quest for Her Past Life Identity and the Healing of Her Eternal Soul.” This account came to my attention because of the early rumors that a film version was in the works; in fact, Phelan herself alludes to a producer’s request for a screenplay of the story (7), but to date, no film of this story has been produced.

28. Lynne Jackson, “An Interview with Pamela Berger,” *Cinéaste* 16, no. 4

In fact, Berger rejected the details of the description of the old woman given by Étienne in his thirteenth-century treatise, remaking her into the forest woman of her choosing—and this choice, this particular construction of the “sorceress” is important to our discussion.

In an interview which appeared in the film journal *Cinéaste* in 1988, Berger responded to questions about her authority in the matter of early medieval women and folk spirituality, levelled at her by Lynne Jackson. An art historian by training, Berger claimed that the idea of making this film grew quite naturally out of her research for her book *The Goddess Obscured*. She stated further, that, armed with a weekend alone at home, and having reviewed a friend’s copy of the script of *Wild Strawberries*, she completed a draft of the screenplay. Citing her research into the history of women’s medicine as proof of her authority on medieval folk-practices and natural healing (and this research was done mainly for the chapter on natural medicine in the feminist bible *Our Bodies Ourselves*), Berger states:

Women were not allowed to learn how to read or write in those days, so we virtually have no written texts from them. There was one woman doctor who lived in Vienna, but basically it doesn’t matter. We know what they did because these women passed their information on to us. We know of their remedies and many of the women historians today are helping us fill in the gaps.

This is where it gets difficult for me: I am both a medievalist and a feminist critic of my own popular culture. I lament the lack of positive depictions of women in our media (whether historical or contemporary) and teach my students to find alternate sources (non-traditional, non-mainstream sources, especially those driven by motives other than industry profits) for their gender models; similarly, my own work on the history of laywomen’s devotional practices has conditioned me to look for

(1988): 45. The monk, Étienne de Bourbon, writes of his encounter with the forest woman in his treatise on the Seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit; for a discussion of Étienne de Bourbon and of the legend of St. Guinefort (the dog-saint of the film), see Jean-Claude Schmitt, *The Holy Greyhound: Guinefort, Healer of Children since the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

what evidence there is in the most unexpected of places. I know that all too often what records we have must be rigorously interrogated as much for what they don't tell us as for what they seem to, when it comes to women's histories. Yet, when I think about this film, and Berger's willing admission of the way in which she handled the few sources there are, I become uneasy. I will try to briefly outline why.

In Étienne de Bourbon's writings, which record his travels and his experiences as a wandering preacher and, most likely, an inquisitor, he describes his encounter with the cult of St. Guinefort. As Berger herself acknowledges, Étienne wrote about both the cult and its practitioners and the forest woman he met in the section of his text dealing with "superstition" and not "witchcraft." This is a subtle difference, perhaps, but one which is worth considering.

Superstition is not heresy or witchcraft and has different implications for an inquisitor and those whom he is questioning. Nothing in Étienne's account suggests that the forest woman was ever in danger of execution for witchcraft, nor would that be consistent with the kinds of punishments meted out for a charge of superstition.²⁹ In the interview cited above, in response to the question "How did you manage not to have the sorceress burned as a heretic in the end?", Berger admits:

It wasn't in the text. The monk actually wrote of this woman in a chapter entitled "superstition" and not "heresy" which was what caught my eye. That was how I began wondering about their relationship and developed the idea that he was intrigued by her in some way, perhaps by her powers, by her remedies.

Berger's misreading of this text, and her retroactive assigning of particularly suspect motives to the monk, charges their conflict with emotions the original doesn't have. In turn, this focuses the narrative into a clearly defined (feminist) battle of a certain sort: making the sorceress a champion in the face of a familiar, but in this case, not necessarily

29. See further, Jean-Claude Schmitt, *The Holy Greyhound*. Schmitt argues that superstition differed from heresy in the distinction between active sin (heresy) and deception (usually by devils, or through weakness, as in women).

authentic, misogynist oppression. Berger manufactures the elements of sexual tension, thus positing a history of sexual violence which, though sadly all too familiar, in this instance redirects the focus of the narrative, enlisting the historical account in a very different kind of contemporary project. Granted, women were executed for the charge of witchcraft, and women were (and continue to be) oppressed by and within misogynist culture. But does that—even given the limited number of positive representations of women countering that oppression—justify a manipulation of existing sources? And how should we—as feminist teachers of medieval sources—attempt to use this film?

Again, if I may return to the uncomfortable position in which I find myself when I consider this film: I want to be able to watch and enjoy, and to show my students, filmic depictions of strong women in medieval settings, but I want, when showing them films which make claims to history, to feel comfortable with the information presented. It seems to me that this film is too much like Phelan's "autobiography," which at best must be described as a self-indulgent project, for me to happily use it in a classroom setting.

There are specific dangers when we introduce films into class discussions that have not been primarily, or even substantially, concerned with films and the discourses of film theory. Berger's screenplay, as irresponsible historically as it is (and the other papers discussed this aspect in more detail), becomes, in my opinion, even more problematic when made visual through Schiffman's skilful camera work and design. How? I've indicated already that I believe that this film makes particular claims to its status as "history," and it does so through various and subtle film techniques which are intended to cause the viewer to engage with it as an authoritative text. For instance, the voice-over, credit notes, the way the frame-story of the legend is employed, are all common signals, familiar filmic conventions which establish a text deliberately as historical or "true" for the uncritical viewer. (Whatever else we may wish to say in favor of our students—and yes, they are undeniably immersed in late twentieth-century media forms—they are nonetheless not naturally, or even in many cases, easily, critical of film.)

Le moine et la sorcière is clearly intended as Berger's (if not Schiffman's as well) revisionist project: an attempt to give sound to the voice she

“imagined” a woman healer might have had. And as a revisionist project, it requires, I believe, more than a small amount of responsibility, equally in how it is used as in how it is initially conceived. Thus, if asked about this particular film, I advise caution and careful consideration when preparing to show it in the classroom. I have used it in two separate, very different teaching contexts: once, in a course on the representations of the Middle Ages in film (senior-level film course within a film program), and again in a medieval literature survey course, where my intent was to provide my students with an easy, enjoyable way into discussions about roles of women. The first instance worked far better than the second, though even in that highly theorized setting in which we foregrounded the filmic conventions and agendas implicit in the construction of “history,” many students left the course remembering the specifically gendered (and manufactured) conflict between the characters as the most important aspect of the film. In both cases, the students found the film—as I do, at least in part—seductive in its beauty, compelling in its narrative, persuasive in its agenda. But in the second instance, the medieval literature survey course, without the introductory lecture I give describing the film as a manufactured object, the product of cultural ideologies and personal agendas at least as much as it is the product of historical narrative, its effect would have been greatly reduced. It is difficult to overstate the power of a skilfully crafted narrative film, especially when it addresses itself—as this film does—to its audience as “historical” and authoritative. I do not believe I will continue to use this film in the classroom and not because I do not credit my students with sufficient critical acumen to wade through the snares laid by a visually beautiful film (though I do think it is absolutely fair to assume that most students without any formal film training—and even some with!—should not be expected to be able to read film critically in every instance). I find, from my own personal experience, in the context of literature courses especially, that this film requires too much distancing to use effectively. That is, it requires too much establishing and counterarguing to make it work within the usual time frames constraining our classes. I remain hopeful, however, for new films, historically and ideologically responsible, skilful, and enjoyable, to introduce to my students.

Water Down the Ventriloquist's Throat: Testing the Voice of the Middle Ages on Film

Margaret Jewett, Dartmouth College

LAST SPRING I TAUGHT A literature seminar for undergraduate French majors in which we examined different medieval literary representations of the heroic figures Roland, Lancelot, and Perceval. Toward the end of the course, I showed the students clips from several film versions in which Lancelot and Perceval are featured (should I ever again have free time, I plan to devote it to writing a Roland screenplay). This recent and only mildly successful experience with using films to teach medieval literature has prompted me to reexamine my motivations for doing so, whence my first piece of advice: I would suggest that a crucial step in preparing to show films in a Medieval Studies course should be to examine one's own motivations for doing so. I would like to begin by dismissing three motivations which were presented to me and which I have also heard in the first person from other professors of medieval literature:

1) If I say in the course description that films will be a part of the course, more students will be interested in taking it. Beware of using "films" as a code for "fun" if you are planning to analyze these films critically and in depth. And why devote a substantial amount of class time to showing films, if not to follow up with in-depth analysis that may seem, to fun-seeking students, to take all the fun out of the films? If others in your department advise you to use film with the argument that we're living in a visual culture, it may be helpful to remind them that students tend to be more interested in visual aids that they would otherwise never see, such as reproductions of pages from medieval manuscripts.

2) Films will make the Middle Ages come alive for the students. To phrase this notion a bit differently, cinematic images of the Middle Ages are vivid and immediately accessible. The danger in this is that film images can overpower the mental image that each student might

create for himself or herself based on study of primary sources. After the course is over, the film images may be more easily recovered from students' memories than the knowledge they built up gradually through study of more complex materials. Even if the student thought while watching a film that it was not a very credible portrayal of the Middle Ages, the images are so strong that they can take on a life of their own in students' imaginations. While discussing films in class, therefore, it may be of particular importance to analyze the film images themselves, rather than limiting the discussion to the general ideas conveyed by the film.

3) By showing the films in class, I will be able to point out their historical inaccuracies. Students may not be trained medieval scholars, but most are experienced moviegoers: they know very well that the primary purpose of these films was not historical accuracy, and therefore professors who attack the films on that basis may seem mean-spirited and overly concerned with details. This risk applies even in the case of films based on real events: even the most superficial review of the many cinematic depictions of the life of Joan of Arc would prove that showing the events exactly as they happened has rarely been a primary concern of directors. Is it wrong for film directors not to make historical accuracy their top priority when communicating the significance of a life like Joan's? If not, are medieval scholars, in fact, mean-spirited for resenting these films' historical inaccuracies? The way in which I have chosen to resolve the apparent conflict between the goals of the medieval scholar and of the "medievalizing" film director is to emphasize what the two points of view share in common: a desire to act as an intermediary between medieval material and the people who are living today. When I examine film directors' own representational goals in working with medieval material, I must explicitly address the question of how and why the Middle Ages are meaningful for people of my own time. This is a question that many people today would simply answer in the negative, saying that studying the Middle Ages is not meaningful. It is therefore a potentially threatening question, and one that could remain harmlessly implicit and extracurricular if I did not choose to raise it.

If I have chosen to discuss films in class, in spite of the risks listed above, it is because I believe that films set in the Middle Ages allow medieval culture and modern culture to enter into a dialogue with each

other. In some cases this may appear to the medievalist to be a ventriloquist's dialogue, in which the voice of present-day culture emerges from a "medieval" dummy on the film director's lap, yet most students have an even greater capacity than ours to recognize the voice of their own culture when they hear it. I believe that it would be futile and misguided to attempt single-handedly to replace what "Middle Ages" means in popular culture with our own scholarly representation of "Middle Ages." Many students will only take one medieval course in their lives, while it appears that popular culture will never tire of using medieval costumes to dress up the expression of thoroughly modern viewpoints. Instead, I have designed for myself a goal that is achievable and respectful of my students' own process of lifelong learning: to prepare students to be more active audience members for films that present themselves as realistic depictions of the Middle Ages. By maintaining a focus on film directors' representational strategies, I may develop in my students an analytical habit that they will bring to the viewing of "medieval" films that will be released in the future. If I simply represent medievalizing films as "wrong," I will instead discourage in my students the desire to continue to ponder the meaning of the Middle Ages for them as twenty-first-century people.

As a first step in this process, it is worthwhile, and quite easy, to establish that all films set in the Middle Ages are anachronistic (at least I can not think of any exceptions), in the sense that they must inevitably use modern objects and modes of perception. Even documentaries can be anachronistic in this perceptual way, for example when they show aerial views of a medieval cathedral that medieval people could never have seen. I am not at all opposed to such camera work, but in the context of studying representation I think it is worthwhile to draw students' attention to it. Certain students will delight in pointing out glaring examples of anachronism, usually involving armor or other physical traits, so I suggest beginning the discussion by pointing out the more subtle examples involving characters' perceptions of the world, both physical and metaphysical. This stage of the discussion should not last too long, because it is important for students to see that "criticism," in the academic sense, means far more than fault-finding.

The second step is to attach meaning to anachronism and oversim-

plification by understanding them as the film's underlying assumptions about life in the Middle Ages and about the viewer's expectations. Such assumptions can be found in the comments on the period that are expressed in the most brief and efficient way possible. For example, it is helpful to draw students' attention to the director's representation of crowds or other nonspeaking characters, because it is there that the viewer is shown "the average person," against whom the exceptional protagonists are usually defined. It is important here not to ridicule the simplicity of these representations, but rather to take seriously their function in elaborating the overall message of the film. Assumptions are a necessary part of coherent expression and must be taken into account when expression itself is the object of study. Students may never have given much conscious thought to the meaning of landscape shots, props and nonspeaking characters, and they will be interested to discover how much implied meaning these elements can convey when the light of conscious examination is cast upon them.

By this point in the discussion, it will be clear to the students that the primary interest of the director of the film was not in portraying the Middle Ages with the greatest historical accuracy. Students should then be encouraged to consider what did motivate the director to choose a medieval setting. If the director has written about the intended meaning of his or her film, or given substantive interviews about it, the students could prepare for the film by reading these materials. To their credit, the apparent motivation of most directors seems to be that of expressing what they perceive to be universal human values, rather than expressing a negative or faulty judgment of the Middle Ages. This discussion of the intended emphasis of the film brings out more clearly a central paradox of films set in the Middle Ages: they usually are not overly concerned with the historical accuracy of represented ideologies or physical details, and yet they almost always show these elements because it is precisely these elements that constitute the "medieval" visual setting. Most film directors try to create a realistic setting (i.e., one that has an internal coherence), but most do not succeed in creating a historically or culturally authentic setting. This distinction between "realistic" and "authentic" is at the heart of many scholars' objections to medievalizing films,

and thus is an important distinction to examine from the viewpoint of artists of both periods.

Students' experience with visual entertainment gives many of them an interest in and a sensitivity to the distinctions between representational categories that might be labeled "realism," "authenticity," and "credibility" (other categories may be relevant, depending on the course and on the films in question). In a course in medieval literature or art history, it would be worth devoting some time to the students' observations about how these representational categories operate in all kinds of present-day entertainment, as a basis for appreciating its parallels with and differences from medieval representation. For example, science fiction and action films use special effects to make increasingly realistic the representation of events that are not credible, such as characters who can assume in their own flesh the facial features of other characters, spontaneously and without surgical intervention. Medieval art had a comparable task, that of representing visually, and often with no accompanying textual explanation, events that were miraculous or invisible to the human eye, such as the ascent of souls to heaven. These shared representational goals may help students to gain a better appreciation for the energy and creativity in the statuary of medieval cathedrals, for example, a form of medieval art that can otherwise seem to modern viewers stiff, visually uniform, and dominated by a static code of symbolic objects and stances. In this example, the modern notion of "suspending disbelief" as an audience member might be discussed in relation to the apparent enterprise of medieval religious art, that of encouraging belief: are these two enterprises the same? Do modern films encourage a kind of faith? Did medieval artists assume a lack of faith that needed to be remedied? The implied relationship between artist and viewer is particularly complex in the case of art that attempts to represent the unrepresentable, and it is helpful for students to analyze that relationship since many forms of modern art and entertainment attempt to draw audience members into it. A comparison of the motivations of medieval and present-day artists for attempting to represent the unrepresentable may lead students to view the art of both periods in new and interesting ways.

Lest I seem overly cynical about the motivations of modern filmmakers, I would like to mention an example that arose in my recent course,

in which a film director used modern beliefs about the supernatural to represent a medieval supernatural event in a way that would be credible for a modern audience. During Perceval's quest for the Holy Grail in John Boorman's film *Excalibur* (1981), Perceval sees the Grail for the first time after he has been hanged in a tree, but the vision promptly vanishes when he is cut down and the pressure on his neck is loosened. Perceval later sees the Grail again after he is pulled down a stream and held underwater by a strong current. In both scenes, it is implied that Perceval's Grail visions are a neurological response to near death experiences, and thus they have a scientific explanation that convinces the modern audience to view them as credible phenomena. Yet when Perceval realizes that doubt has been his greatest failing, and hope his greatest strength, he is able to bring a physical Grail back to Arthur through an apparent process of instant teleportation. In this sequence of Grail scenes, modern scientific observations persuade the audience to accept the Grail visions as realistic insofar as they are the product of an altered state of consciousness; the audience can then experience authentic surprise when the supernatural phenomenon that had already been explained away suddenly becomes once again unexplainable. Without the introductory scenes of the visions as near death experiences, the viewer might have learned to experience the cinematic Grail as "fake-looking"; when the viewer has already been convinced that the Grail is only a vision, however, the moment when Perceval grasps it in his hands can conjure up the genuine wonder that the Grail was originally designed to inspire. In my opinion, then, this series of scenes is a fitting tribute to the medieval Grail texts, since it uses the tools of modernity in the service of medieval artistic goals.

This comparison of specific representational strategies in modern films and medieval art objects is probably the most potentially productive stage of the discussion, but it may be necessary for the professor to begin by presenting several examples to model this type of analysis for students who are unaccustomed to taking films seriously as objects of study. In the last stage, the discussion might move back to the production of overall meaning: students could attempt to identify the overall messages of medieval texts or other art objects, just as they have identified the

modern films' overall messages. I received two responses to this question of overall meaning, each of which is helpful:

1) The overall message of the medieval text, like that of its corresponding film adaptation, is the advocacy of a universal human value, but where the film might have emphasized "freedom," the medieval text might have emphasized "charity" or "loyalty." We can then discuss the presence or absence of "freedom" in the medieval text and of "charity" or "loyalty" in the film. This comparative step is worthwhile because students may find that "freedom" was a value for medieval characters, but not an absolute value, or that "loyalty" is represented as a personal value in the film but as a collective value in the text.

2) There is no clear overall message in the medieval text, or whatever overall message is explicitly advocated is also problematized by certain episodes or narrative comments in the text. Some of my students observed that the modern films tended to be more prescriptive than the medieval texts about how the audience is meant to interpret the characters and events, even though the students initially perceived a more didactic tone in the medieval texts. This was one of the moments of class discussion that made me consider it worthwhile to have devoted so much time to showing and then discussing films in class: all that effort will be well worth it if my students learn to analyze more critically films that present themselves as pure entertainment, when in fact they advocate all sorts of moral beliefs and prejudices. In fact, the implied messages of modern films are analogous to the messages of medieval texts and works of art in that they are created and controlled not only by directors but also by the people who provide funding for their costly production. The whole notion of "independent" filmmakers suggests that the institution of the wealthy patron of the arts is alive and well and causing certain voices to be heard more clearly than others. I think it is worthwhile to suggest to students of medieval literature that the medieval texts we can read today represent the point of view of a privileged minority of medieval people who could afford to produce manuscripts. It is also worth pointing out that funding sources are a perpetual problem for artistic expression.

To sum up, it requires quite a bit of preparation and class time to elucidate these complex issues of representation and audience reception

in films with medieval settings. As I have suggested here, the resulting observations focus perhaps even more on modern culture than on medieval culture, and as such might not seem an appropriate use of class time to certain professors or, indeed, to certain students. The consensus of the students in my most recent course was that the films had provided an interesting comparison with the medieval texts that had inspired them, but that study of the texts had been more rewarding than study of the films. Some students simply said that the texts had been more meaningful to them. Others put it in more quantitative terms, expressing their frustration that class time had been devoted to the films, when that time otherwise might have been devoted to further discussion of the books they had put so much time into reading between classes. In light of these students' comments, I would like to stress once again the importance of understanding one's own reasons for using films in class, being able to identify what actual value the films will add to the course as a whole. Films can be used for purposes other than those I have identified above, but they must be used with some clear purpose in order to compensate for their inherent potential for distraction.

No matter what motivates a professor to use films in a Medieval Studies course, it would be hard to escape one consequence of doing so: when I emphasize that the Middle Ages and a modern filmmaker's view of the Middle Ages are necessarily two separate things, I point out the margin for error in any modern person's view of the Middle Ages, including my own. Studying films, particularly recent Hollywood films, encourages students to step outside the familiar frame of reading assignments and classroom discussions and to see Medieval Studies as a process in which we examine what remains of the past wherever we find it, examining in the same moment the continuing process of historical perception and representation. Students can observe that this process is not merely institutional but also individual, for scholars as well as for filmmakers, and potentially for the students themselves. This sense of personal involvement is a healthy antidote to what I often perceive as the dangerously passive entertainment culture currently surrounding us all.

Appendix

Films and Special Sessions Sponsored by the Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship at the International Congress on Medieval Studies, Western Michigan University, 1999-2011

1999 *The Sorceress*

A Medieval Film Fest: Plagues, Grails, and Witchcraft II: Suzanne Schiffman's *The Sorceress*

Sponsor: Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship

Organizer: Virginia Blanton-Whetsell, Marist College, and Anne Clark Bartlett, DePaul University.

Presider: Virginia Blanton-Whetsell

Under the Spell of the Sorceress: Modern Conceits and the Allure of the Medieval; Mary Suydam, Ohio Wesleyan University

The Greyhound and the Sorceress; Constance Brittain Bouchard, University of Akron

Medievalists at the Movies; Marilynn Desmond, Binghamton University

Film and the Question of Women's History; Jacqueline Jenkins, University of Calgary

2000 *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*

Visualizing Joan: Cinematic Representations of the Saint (Dreyer's *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*)

Sponsor: International Joan of Arc Society and Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship

Organizer: Bonnie Wheeler, Southern Methodist University
Presider: Jeremy du Quesnay Adams, Southern Methodist University

Joan of Arc among the Nazis: From Dreyer to Gustav Ucicky;
Kevin J. Harty, La Salle University

The Contemporaneous Reception of Dreyer's *La Passion de
Jeanne d'Arc*; Robin Blaetz, Emory University

Carl Dreyer's Passion Play; Gail Orgelfinger, University of
Maryland

2001 *Kristin Lavransdattar*

Women in Scandinavian Culture

Sponsor: Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship

Organizer: Virginia Blanton-Whetsell, Marist College

Presider: Jenny Jochens, Towson University

Undset, Feminism, and the Medieval Church; Sherrill Harbison,
Trinity and Smith Colleges

Sigrid Undset and Fourteenth-Century Spirituality; Peter G.
Christensen, Cardinal Stritch University

Dainty Feet in Scarlet Hose: Using Undset, via Ullmann, in
Teaching the Ballad Tradition; Sandra Straubhaar, University of
Texas–Austin

2002 *Ordo Virtutum*

Hildegard of Bingen's *Ordo Virtutum*

Sponsor: Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship

Organizer: Virginia Blanton-Whetsell, Marist College

Presider: Virginia Blanton-Whetsell

Pin the Tale on the Protagonist: Defining Characters in
Hildegard's *Ordo Virtutum*; Julie Crosby, Columbia University

Envisioning the *Ordo Virtutum*; Sarah Bromberg, Fitchburg State College

“In symphonia sonare”: The Music of the *Ordo Virtutum*; Olivia Carter Mather, University of California–Los Angeles

The Theological Significance of the Virtues in the *Ordo Virtutum*; Margot Fassler, Yale University

2003 *The Lion in Winter*

Re-Presenting Eleanor of Aquitaine: A Panel Discussion

Sponsor: Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship

Organizer: Bonnie Wheeler, Southern Methodist University

Presider: Bonnie Wheeler

The Outlandish Lioness: Eleanor of Aquitaine in Literature; Fiona Tolhurst, Alfred University

The Crowned Queen: Age and Beauty in the Careers of Katharine Hepburn and Eleanor of Aquitaine; Joyce Coleman, University of North Dakota

Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Quarrel over Medieval Women’s Power; Constance H. Berman, University of Iowa

Do We Know What We Think We Know? Making Assumptions about Eleanor of Aquitaine; RáGena C. DeAragon, Gonzaga University

2004 *The Virgin Spring*

Women and Violence in the Middle Ages

Sponsor: Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship

Organizer: Virginia Blanton, University of Missouri–Kansas City

Presider: Sandra Ballif Straubhaar, University of Texas–Austin

Tales of Virginia, the Invisible Medieval Heroine; Terri L. Major,
University of Washington–Seattle

The Violence of Language and Language of Violence in Chaucer's
Legend of Good Women; Jen Gonyer-Donohue, University of
Washington–Seattle

Venus and Violent Attraction in John Gower's *Confessio amantis*;
Georgiana Donavin, Westminster College

2005 *Stealing Heaven*

Heloise in History, Fiction, and Film

Sponsor: Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship

Organizer: Virginia Blanton, University of Missouri–Kansas City,
and Bonnie Wheeler, Southern Methodist University

Presider: Lorraine K. Stock, University of Houston

The Passion of (H)eloise: Alexander Pope's *Epistle of Eloise to
Abelard*; June-Anne Greeley, Sacred Heart University

Interpreting Heloise; Sharan Newman, National Coalition of
Independent Scholars

“A Roman Soul and a Heart of Fire”: Reading Heloise in the Early
Modern Period; Juanita Feros Ruys, University of Sydney

Sexing Heloise in *Stealing Heaven*; Bonnie Wheeler, Southern
Methodist University

2006 *The Anchoress*

Christine Carpenter and the Anchoritic Imaginary

Sponsor: International Anchoritic Society and the Society for
Medieval Feminist Scholarship

Organizer: Susannah Mary Chewning, Union County College

Presider: Susannah Mary Chewning

The Modernization of Christine Carpenter; Michelle M. Sauer,
Minot State University

Metamorphosing into the Penitentiary: Christine Carpenter,
the Anchorhold, and Hierarchies of Repression; Liz Herbert
McAvoy, University of Wales–Swansea

Redefining the Anchorhold: The Politics of Enclosure in the
Twentieth Century; Jennifer Floray Balke, University of Kansas

Unsettling the Gaze in Julian of Norwich's *Revelations* and Chris
Newby's *Anchoress*; Jane E. Jeffrey, West Chester University

2007 *Kriemhilds Rache*

“Hell Hath No Fury”: The Politics of Women’s Emotions

Sponsor: Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship

Organizer: Lisa Perfetti, Muhlenberg College

Presider: Valerie Allen, John Jay College, CUNY

Women, Warfare, and the Politics of Emotion in the Middle Ages;
Colleen Slater, Cornell University

“A Syngular and a Specyal Yyfte”: The Sorrow of Margery Kempe;
Emily Rebekah Huber, University of Rochester

Emma of Blois: Arbiter of Peace and the Politics of Patronage;
Mickey Abel, University of North Texas, and George Neal,
University of North Texas

Discussant: Lisa Perfetti

2008 *The Da Vinci Code*

Facts, Fakes, and AntiFeminism in *The Da Vinci Code*

Sponsor: Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship

Organizer: Ilan Mitchell-Smith, Angelo State University, and Marla
Segol, Skidmore College

Presider: Ilan Mitchell-Smith

Apostle to the Apostles, Reformed Prostitute, Royal Baby
Machine: The Many Faces of Mary Magdalene; Felice Lifshitz,
Florida International University

Brown's Kabbalah: Binding and Unbinding the Divine Feminine in
The Da Vinci Code; Marla Segol, Skidmore College

Queering the Code: Jesus and Mary or Jesus and John?; Madeline
H. Caviness, Tufts University

2009 *Beowulf*

Matrons, Monsters, and Men: *Beowulf* (2007)

Sponsor: Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship

Organizer: Helene Scheck, University at Albany, and Ilan Mitchell-
Smith, Angelo State University

Presider: Colleen Slater, Cornell University

"Ond Hyre Seax Geteah Brad ond Brunecg": Failing Swords and
Angelina's Heels in Robert Zemeckis's *Beowulf*; Kelly Ann
Fitzpatrick, University at Albany

The Water Dripped from Her like "Golden Chocolate": Mother's
Feminine Threat in *Beowulf*; Michelle Kustarz, Wayne State
University

Cyborg Masculinities in Zemeckis's *Beowulf*; Laurie Dietz, DePaul
University

2010 *Ladyhawke*

Women and Chivalry in Richard Donner's *Ladyhawke* (A Roundtable)

Sponsor: Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship

Organizer: Ilan Mitchell-Smith, California State University–Long
Beach

Presider: Ilan Mitchell-Smith

A roundtable discussion with Amy S. Kaufman, Wesleyan College;
Megan Moore, University of Illinois–Chicago; Lynn Tarte Ramey,
Vanderbilt University; and Lynn Shutters, Idaho State University/
University of Michigan–Ann Arbor

2011 *The Devils*

Flaming Bodies in Ken Russell's *The Devils*

Sponsor: Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship

Organizer: Lynn Arner, Brock University

Presider: Lynn Arner

Inquisitive Politics, Deviant Bodies: The Trope of Mary Magdalene
in Ken Russell's *The Devils*; Nhora Lucía Serrano, California
State University–Long Beach

Queering the Medieval Witch: Asmodiai, Grandier, and Ken
Russell's *The Devils*; Susannah Mary Chewing, Union County
College