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Abstract

This thesis explores the theme of doubleness in the fields of film and theatre. I would like to use the word, “doubleness,” to refer to the wide range of states which contain any dual or overlapping aspects, beyond the normal association of the word, “double,” as meaning, “a person who looks exactly like another.” I also use the word, “doubling,” when I would like to emphasise the act of repeating or overlapping states. I will examine the doubleness not only within or in between characters but also within relationships between the created film world and the real world in which the creators have produced the film reality.

The thesis consists of two parts. Part I deals with films by a Polish film director, Krzysztof Kieslowski, in three chapters. Kieslowski is a Polish film director who was born in 1942 and died in 1996. He started his career as a documentary filmmaker and shifted to become a feature film director, which has earned him a great international acclaim. The first chapter will examine the issue of doubleness in The Double Life of Veronique, focusing on the doubled relation between Weronika and Veronique as well as on Veronique’s boyfriend, Alexandre’s interaction within this doubled relationship. The significance of Alexandre’s occupation as a puppeteer is considered as part of the argument. The doubleness found in the process of the production is also discussed. The second chapter will be divided into three sections in order to discuss different types of doubleness in the three works that constitute a trilogy, Three Colours: Blue, White, Red. The final chapter of Part I will consider the doubling between the creators and the created of these films, focusing on some of the film characters who are seen as doubles of the director and the musical director. His earlier works will also be discussed when relevant throughout these three chapters.

Part II introduces my own theatre creations and includes some comparisons with Kieslowski’s films. My theatrical work created during the course mainly concerns the scriptwriting and staging of Cul de Sac and Requiem. Cul de Sac was written and staged in 1999, and deals with the main character’s self-discovery through encounters with her doubles in dream. Requiem was produced in the following year and features an integration of classical piano performance as part of a theatrical piece. Here the central issue is the double personality of the main character who is born as a Siamese twin and has created the personality of her dead twin sister inside her mind. The whole thesis deals with the issue of doubleness in order to explore the significance of understanding this subject for a richer comprehension of films and theatre works; for a better understanding of one’s own identity; and for acknowledging the connections between people beyond time and space through this mysterious mediation of doubles.
I certify that this thesis does not, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

(i) incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any institution of higher education;

(ii) contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text; or

(iii) contain any defamatory material.
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Introduction

This thesis intends to examine how the idea of "doubleness" is and can be related to human life. The idea of doubleness, in a broad sense, appears in a variety of manifestations within and around us and an understanding of these states can lead to measures of self-discovery as well as to an enriched appreciation of interrelationships between people. There are numerous films, plays, literary and psychological / psychiatristical works about doubles. The term, "double," is usually associated with "a person who looks exactly like another." However, by choosing the term, "doubleness," I would like to explore not only those states wherein some character has a double figure but also those situations in which any dual or overlapping layers of images or ideas can be found. I also use the word, "doubling," when I would like to emphasise the act of repeating or overlapping states. I will examine the doubleness not only within or in between characters but also within relationships between the created film world and the real world in which the creators have produced the film reality. Firstly, I would like to introduce different types of doubleness, explored mainly in films and, then, to examine how this idea emerges in a variety of forms in the works of a Polish film director, Krzysztof Kieslowski.

Carl Jung mentions the duality of our psychology at the beginning of his book, Man and His Symbols. He says that many modern people suffer from the divided personality of consciousness and unconsciousness and that the situation is a normal rather than a pathological phenomenon. He underlines the point, saying, "It is not only the neurotic whose right hand does not know what the left hand is doing." It is significant to consider such a duality as our own problem and not only evidence of "nervous disorders" in psychopaths in order to gain a deeper understanding of ourselves. In adopting this approach, studies of personality disorders open out into a study of our own personal psychology, perhaps enabling us to gain a deeper understanding of its internal workings.

Robert Louis Stevenson's Dr. Jekyll is an archetypal character who suffers from a split personality. He is conscious of his internal contrastive personality and has an irresistible desire to release his hidden evil character in one way or another. He feels excited when he finally succeeds in developing his famous drug that enables him to achieve a metamorphosis. However, his tragedy lurks in the fact that he undervalues the power of his unconscious and fails to think of the possibility that his hidden side could...
become the controlling power. Gradually he is threatened by the fear of being manipulated by his own device, to be a marionette of his own but unknown self. In contrast, the film, *Nutty Professor*, a parodic comedy of *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, offers a happy ending after all the hassle caused by the results of a miracle drug which enables the professor to immediately achieve a reduction in his obese figure. Here the main comic character is an enormously fat and gawky professor named Dr. Sherman Klump who has been the object of fun and wishes to be an opposite type of person. As with Dr. Jekyll, he works hard to devise a drug to realize his dream and, when he successfully metamorphoses into a slim and handsome young man, Buddy Love, he enjoys all the respect and attention he gains from people including a beautiful female colleague. However, as with Mr. Hyde, this newly released character does not know how to be moderate and, subsequently rejects being under the control of his original self, the professor. In the end, the professor realizes that the most important thing is to be honest rather than deceitful with people and himself, even if things do not turn out as he wishes.

*William Wilson* by Edgar Allan Poe gives us another interpretation of the interaction between double figures. Here, as opposed to the above two cases, it is the main character who leads an unreasonable life. He does not hesitate to accomplish his purpose by fair means or foul. He hates to listen to his double figure who seems to take the role of his conscience and tries to reason with him about his mistakes. In the end, the central protagonist takes steps to kill this figure, only to realize that such an action would cause his own downfall. John Herdman describes it clearly as follows: “Wilson has resolved to kill the voice of conscience.” Now Wilson finally realizes the significance of this voice to himself. He is the loser and there is no way left to restore this loss. This “self-murder” ending contrasts with the path chosen by Dr. Jekyll, who kills his evil character in order to prevent the worst possible case, in the last moment, of Mr. Hyde assuming total control. In a film adaptation of *William Wilson*, Alain Delon plays both of the William Wilsons' roles. It is amazing to see the same actor standing in the scene as two different characters, each of which is as real as the other. He also plays a similar kind of role in *La Tulipe Noire*, where he is playing the roles of brothers who are contrastive in character but identical in appearance. Apparently the film industry, by way of superimposition technologies, has opened up greater possibilities to present images of doubles.

In all of these three stories, the main character's split personality assumes concrete
physical corporeality and interacts with the original. However there is a major difference illuminated by the comparison. Robert Rogers claims that there are two different kinds of doubling known as “autoscopy” and “multiple personality” in his study, *A Psychoanalytic Study of the Double in Literature*. He says that: “Compared to autoscopy, multiple personality involves behavioral dissociation in time, whereas autoscopy involves visual ‘dissociation’ in space.” He takes *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* as the classic example of the multiple personality in literature. According to this analysis, both Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Klump present cases of multiple personality, for they never physically coexist with their split personality at the same time, while the two William Wilsons share the same space at the one time. Edgar Allan Poe implies the possibility of the autoscopy of Wilson several times in the text. In the very final scene, there are not only two Wilsons but also a mirror, which makes the border between the two Wilsons far more ambiguous with than without. David Edgar, however, has added an interesting variation to the case of Dr. Jekyll by his adaptation of the story for stage. In this play of the same title as the original, he divides the central roles into two, assigning different actors for Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. It enables them to share the same time and space and converse with each other. To put it into the context of Roger’s theory, he has added the phenomenon of autoscopy to the case of multiple personality as a new device in which to present the double figure.

In *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and *Nutty Professor*, their double figures also function as disguises to attain certain desires by masking their socially recognized faces. I would like to examine the role of disguise in the following section. *Mrs. Doubtfire* offers an excellent example of a disguise as an aspect of doubleness. In this film, Robin Williams plays the double role of a middle-aged man who has been deserted by his wife and that of an old woman who works as a housemaid at his estranged wife and children’s house. He feels desperate when he is forced to be separated from his children. But when he is informed that his wife is looking for a housemaid, he visits a friend who is a mask maker, thinking that the only possible way to spend enough time with his children is to become the housemaid. Now he acquires another social face as Mrs. Doubtfire and visits his wife in order to be interviewed for the job. In this film, the audience knows that Mrs. Doubtfire is the disguised main character, as the screen shows the process of the doubling transformation, of which his family are unaware. The make up looks real enough to deceive the other characters in the film. What makes this movie comical is this gap in the levels of recognition of the
strange housemaid between the audience's and the characters' points of view. No other mask could be as real as the masks worn by Tom Cruise in Mission Impossible. Disguise enables him to acquire whatever information he needs as a government spy. It is so real that even his fellow colleagues cannot tell the difference between the real and the fake personality when he is in disguise, and it is same for the audience. In contrast with the case of Mrs. Doubtfire, this suspense about “Who is who?” adds to the thrills that the film produces.

The above-mentioned characters use special make-up to cover their real faces, for they need to alter their socially recognised faces if they hope to accomplish their objectives. Dr. Jekyll releases his desire only after he has achieved the methods to change his appearance. Without the device, he would never have proceeded, for it is too risky, almost impossible for him to behave like Mr. Hyde while assuming Dr. Jekyll’s role in the society. In many detective stories, the criminals disguise themselves in order to stay in the land of the living after committing a crime which the society does not allow. Paradoxically, however, when they cover their faces with masks, they are actually uncovering their desire. Now their persona, their social mask, is covered by their real face, shadow. Therefore, we can focus on their behaviours when they are disguised in order to learn what their real intentions may be.

We have seen the cases of doubles accompanied with physical change whether it is caused by a drug or by make-up. Here I would like to talk about metamorphoses, which result from changes in the characters’ mental states. Probably these are more common phenomena than the above-mentioned cases. The Jekyll-and-Hyde type stories are apparently unrealistic science fictions and extreme disguises are not to be seen on a day to day basis. On the other hand, it is rather common to see someone look different when he or she is angry, or to find someone changed after some years’ absence, for instance.

Bette Davis demonstrates a good example of this phenomenon in Now Voyager. It is surprising to see how she presents two comparatively distinct faces in this film. The story is about a woman’s self-development through establishing her independence from her dominant mother. At first, the heroine, played by Davis, looks extremely timid, nervous, and socially inept due to the oppressive nature of the relations with her mother. Physically she wears milk-bottle glasses and unrefined clothes, which rather suit her image at this stage. In contrast, when she departs for her voyage both literally and metaphorically with the help of psychotherapy, her physical image totally changes into a woman of sophisticated and appealing fashion accompanied with equivalent manners.
and attitudes. This projected image is a reflection of her achieving self-confidence. No matter how hard a woman tries to make herself up, if her behaviour does not suit the projected image, she would look just awkward.

When the heroine appears on the screen after this change, I had to think for a while if she was really being played by the same actress. I became eager to detect any sign of identification: the height of nose, the shape of lips, those attributes that could not be changed through acting or a normal make-up. Previously she had shocked me by how ugly she appeared and, now, she amazes me with her beauty. Her friends and relatives in the film are equally impressed at her change after the voyage, as if to say, "Where is that gawky, timid girl? Who is this confident, attractive lady?" Her boyfriend, with whom she became close during her travels, cannot recognise her when she shows him her family photo, even asking about the girl, while pointing at her image. This reaction makes an impact on the new, immature skin that she has just developed after casting off the previous figure, and she bursts into tears, telling him her story. But gradually she strengthens her new face and, finally, she declares her independence from her mother.

Similar personality development can be found in the novel, *Rebecca*, by Daphne du Maurier. Alfred Hitchcock adapted the novel for a film under the same title in 1940. The heroine is an introverted, unsophisticated girl at the beginning of the narrative. She marries a rich gentleman, Mr. de Winter, and moves to a countryside manor, Manderley. She is from a poor family and, coupled with her shyness, she finds it hard to fit in with the way of life in this new circumstance. Moreover, she feels oppressed by the dominating chief housemaid, Mrs. Danvers, through her frequent and intentional comparison of the new wife with the previous Mrs. de Winter, namely Rebecca. This unfavourable comparison makes the new wife look far more clumsy and inadequate. As Mr. de Winter's problem is uncovered, she feels the need to become strong in order to resolve the situation for the both of them and this decision leads to a great change in her manner and behaviour. However, such a change is not always welcomed. In fact, Mr. de Winter tells her that he misses the personality that she had before. She explains to him that her change of temperament has helped to solve the trouble. At the same time, she has had to pay the cost of losing the great part of her former self.

This sense of loss may be similar to what people with multiple personality disorder experience when they lose most of their personalities in order to reach a stage of integration. To introduce this disorder briefly, it is now formally called as "dissociative identity disorder," and is defined as "a psychiatric disorder characterized by having at
least one ‘alter’ personality which controls behaviour. The ‘alters’ are said to occur spontaneously and involuntarily, and function more or less independently of each other." At the final stage of their therapy, these individuals need to integrate their personalities to be one united entity. However, the process does not always proceed smoothly, and even when they succeed, meaning, when they basically overcome their disorder, the result is not necessarily a happy ending. In the writings which record the process of therapy for this disorder such as The Minds of Billy Milligan by Daniel Keyes and I’m Eve by Chris Costner Sizemore and Elen Sain Pittillo, the main characters express their sadness to lose their personalities with whom they have lived literally together for so many years. We cannot take with us everything we have had, if we want to go somewhere else. We have to choose the most important thing to carry with us into the future.

Family connection represents another phenomenon of doubles and appears in the strong connection between twins, between parents and children or between ancestors and descendants. On the Black Hill offers an example, being a film focused on the intense relationship between identical twin brothers across four generations. It is set in the Welsh border country and the story deals with the issue of Welsh nationalism as well as with family problems. The film is directed and scripted by Andrew Grieve, from the novel by Bruce Chatwin. The twin brothers, Louis and Benjamin, are brought up together, sharing their pleasure and sadness, in a farming house on the Black Hill. When they grow older and their circumstances force them to be apart from each other, they feel each other’s pain and at times find their twin’s face in the mirror instead of their own image (they have gained difference in their appearance as well as in their character, as they grew older). For example, when Benjamin is lost on a snowy hill and is about to freeze to death, Louis, who is in the city, finds his own body freezing. He rushes to the hill and saves his twin’s life. Likewise Benjamin feels a sudden pain when Louis dies in a car accident. Their firm connection has prevented them from pursuing separate lives and families, having caused friction between them at the same time. Eventually, they spend 80 years together in the same house, even sharing the same bed since their childhood. Their only family, in the late stage of their lives, is their late sister’s grandson. In this child they recognise their own childhood, and this realisation enables them to share the enjoyment of having him around, in contrast with the case when Louis found a girlfriend and caused trouble with Benjamin. This grandson is actually played by one of the actors who played the roles of young Louis and Benjamin.
This technique of using one actor for two different characters is occasionally used, as for example, in the Italian film, Fiorile. This film presents us with an instance of the phenomenon of doubles between an ancestor and a descendent. The story is about a family who has been cursed through generations ever since a young peasant stole a box of gold coins from a handsome French lieutenant, while he was having an affair with the peasant’s beautiful sister. As a result, the lieutenant is killed by the French army and the girl dies when she bears his baby. The gold coins have been kept within the family through generations, only later to bring about another tragedy. Now the family has acquired an established upper-class social position and, when a young family member falls in love with a peasant man, her ambitious brother, a politician, conspires to send him away. When informed of the plot by her youngest brother, she kills both brothers in a forest by feeding them with poisonous mushrooms. This character is performed by the same actress who plays the role of the peasant girl, her ancestor. In addition, the present character perceives the peasant girl’s image when she looks at the water’s surface just before committing the murders.

Generations later, a male family member experiences seeing his double in his French ancestor, the lieutenant. The double appears when this sensitive boy is feeling lonely and sad throughout his childhood, until he finds a lover. Now the action is set in the time of the Second World War, when the young man is involved in a tragedy. His girlfriend is taken away by soldiers and he suffers from being haunted by the family curse for the rest of his life. His part is played by the actor who also plays the role of the lieutenant. Coincidence occurs when this character is nearly killed in the same field where the lieutenant was once shot. Later in his life, he lives alone in the family house, keeping his son and grandchildren away from the cursed land. Still, for himself, he keeps a hand-made life-size statue of the lieutenant in his attic, in whose cotton belly is hidden the last golden coin. The technique of using the same actor for different characters is effective in order to represent the special bonds between them such as affection, dependence, obsession and blood relationship.

We have seen different types of doubles above, all of which can be categorised into one larger group since these images of doubles are aspects of the specific character’s psychology. Many of the doubles are generated from desire, such as in the cases of Mr. Hyde, Mrs. Doubtfire and the heroine of Now Voyager; while some of them are derived from a strong sense of connection, like the delusions of ancestors in Fiorile and the shared experiential understanding between twins in On the Black Hill.
Other doubles appear to fill in some lack in the basic character, such as the lack of conscience in William Wilson, or in the lack of ability to handle problems in those with multiple personality disorder.

Now I would like to introduce another kind of doubled image from the perspective of those who view a particular character from the outside. Janet Frame offers a good example. She is the author of a range of works including three autobiographies, which provide the basis for a film, *An Angel at My Table*, directed by Jane Campion. Bridget Ikin, who is one of the producers of this film, raises an interesting issue in her essay on Frame, “An Assemblage of Janets” in *The Inward Sun*. Here Ikin emphasises the point that she and the other producers of the film consider Frame’s autobiographies as fiction, in her words, “as much fiction as any of the novels,” and she makes it clear that their film is “their” fiction converted from “her” fiction, and not intended to present “real” images. She illustrates this point in the essay through a photo of Frame with the other three Janets of the film, “little Janet,” “teenage Janet,” and “Janet” as an adult. This photo, which is also used for the cover for the video case of the film, seems to symbolise the whole issue. The three actors, who were deliberately cast and made up to present basic similarities in appearance, create the image of Frame for those who know about her only from this film. Some of them might well wonder for a moment if they looked at the photo after watching the film, “Oh I know these three Janets, but who is this strange old lady standing behind them?” She looks just like an ordinary old lady with average curly hair, nothing eccentric as is emphasised in the film. Such a real image may sometimes disappoint audiences who expect a dramatic extraordinariness in the image of famous figures. In other words, the actual person’s image may appear less real than that conveyed by the actors. Audiences might well expect an impression of an angel in the appearance of a Nightingale, or of heroism in Schindler, if they know about them only through dramatised versions of stories based on actual life experiences, which would often be the case.

John Money deals with the same kind of issue in his “On Being Brian Wilford and John Forrest,” another short essay on Frame in *The Inward Sun*. He is the model of John Forrest, for Frame’s autobiographies, and of Brian Wilford in *Living in the Maniototo*, a fiction by Janet Frame. He makes a clear comment on being a model as follows: “I have as many biographies as there are people who have ever known me. . . . They are the mirrors I must see myself.” Therefore Frame offers one of his mirrors to reflect two versions of who he is. According to this theory, the film would give a third version of
him in the director's interpretation of his character, derived from the mirror made by Frame. As he argues, this is a matter of epistemology, and it seems essential to be conscious of such a concept, when we see some character in any created works about a real figure, in films, plays, fictions, and even those works considered as non-fictions or documentaries. As soon as a story is transformed into another form, it inevitably involves the maker's perspective and intention, which can cause a dangerous misreading if we take it at its face value. I would like to examine an example from Freud's case study, Dora: A Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria (1905).

Dora, whose real name was Ida Bauer, was born in Vienna in 1882, and was treated by Freud at 18, for she was suffering from hysterical symptoms as well as expressing desires to commit suicide. Her case has been controversial among contemporary feminist, literary, and psychoanalytical critics. Linda Ruth Williams points out in her Critical desire - Psychoanalysis and the Literary Subject that Freud's case histories have been increasingly interpreted as short stories, especially after Steven Marcus analyzed the case of Dora as literature in 1974. Helene Cixous adapted the story into a play, Portrait of Dora, in 1976. Cixous had a strong motivation in adapting the case: she aimed to explode the patriarchal framework that Freud applied to his analysis of Dora and to suggest other possibilities in interpreting the case which could not be found through the frames of patriarchy and heterosexuality. It is more than possible that some other people could claim the validity of interpreting Dora's case in neither patriarchal nor feminist viewpoints and, thereby, drawing a totally different portrait of Dora. In fact, as Money says, she will have as many portraits as there are people who have ever known or written about her. The limitless images will lie one upon another, reflected on endless layers of mirrors: the mirrors, which, at the same time, reflect the images of the makers themselves.

We have briefly looked at various examples of doubles above, just to name a few. There are a variety of materials to choose from in order to demonstrate the theme of doubleness. The films of Krzysztof Kieslowski are selected from among the possibilities to be the main materials for the following discussion in this paper. Kieslowski is a Polish film director who was born in 1942 and died in 1996. He studied at the Lodz Film School, which has produced renowned film directors such as Andrzej Wajda, Roman Polanski and Krzysztof Zanussi. He started his career as a documentary filmmaker and then changed to feature film directing, which has brought him great international acclaim.
The Double Life of Veronique, but also many of his other films explore some sort of doubleness. There have been studies which examine his films in relation to the issue of doubles as part of their discussion of his works, however, it does not seem that there has been a study in which the issue of doubleness penetrates the whole analysis of all his major films. I have also realised that the idea of doubleness, when employed as an analytical tool, often gives a clue to understanding the mysterious nature of his films.

Kieslowski often presents a double figure in a subtle and unique way. For instance, in The Double Life of Veronique, the two main characters, Weronika and Veronique, who are in a doubled relation to each other, do not confront each other in a direct way, unlike many other works which deal with the theme of a double, some of which we have seen above. Although Weronika and Veronique sense each other’s existence, their connection is presented in a very subtle way. Paul Coates pays attention to the same point: “In the classic scenario of doubling, self and reflection meet in simultaneous face-off. In The Double Life of Veronique, however, the only Kieslowski film explicitly to raise the theme, the heroine’s two lives do not parallel and confront one another, but are successive: Weronika’s death shifts the narrative from Poland to the France of her alter ego.”13 Moreover, they are not as different from each other as the typical Jekyll-and-Hyde like characters whose characteristics demonstrate contrasting possibilities.

In No End, one of Kieslowski’s earlier feature films, the heroine’s husband appears as a ghost throughout the film. However, the heroine, Urszula, does not interact with the ghost in an explicit manner as in the Ghost directed by Jerry Zucker, starring Demi Moore. Urszula realises her love for her husband after his death. Her husband has become a ghost after death and watches over his wife. Urszula senses that her husband is still with her but, basically, she cannot see him. In the end, she decides to commit suicide. Only after her death, can she be reunited with her husband, with which image the film ends. Their figures appear half transparent and they pass through the walls of their house to leave the world together.

A Short Film about Love presents another kind of double in the ending scene. The story is about a young man, Tomek, who peeps into the life of an older woman, Magda, living in the same apartment complex. One night, he finds her crying in the kitchen. The next day, he confesses her that he has been spying on her due to his love for her. Eventually, Magda invites him into her place and ends up in destroying his naïve understanding of love. Tomek attempts to commit suicide and is hospitalised. Returning from the hospital, he stops peeping at her life and, in reverse, Magda begins to look into
his apartment, realising the importance of his pure sense of love. In the end, she visits his apartment shared with the mother of his close friend who has gone abroad. Tomek is asleep in bed, and Magda finds his telescope covered on his desk. She looks into the telescope to see her apartment. Then she begins to picture the night that Tomek found her crying. At first, she is the only one in the scene, but then, she imagines Tomek visiting her to console her sorrow. The Tomek in this scene is a kind of double created inside Magda’s mind. It is born from the viewer, Magda’s wish, who has lost Tomek’s love.

Blind Chance, another feature film by Kieslowski, presents a different type of double. The protagonist is named Witek, a medical student, and the film shows three stories about his life based on whether or not he catches a train after deciding to quit his studies. The first story focuses on Witek catching the train, meeting a communist and becoming a member of the party himself. He meets his first love one day but their relationship does not last very long owing to friction between them caused by his communist affiliations. He is offered an opportunity to go to France, but fails to take the plane for France. In the second story, he misses the train and gets arrested by a station officer for crashing into him while he was rushing to catch the train. He is condemned to serving some time as a labourer and during his sentence he acquaints himself with a soldier. He decides to join the army. He has another opportunity to visit France but, again, he ends up not leaving his country. In the third episode, he misses the train and encounters a fellow medical student whom he eventually marries. Witek completes his medical studies and, later, when his wife is pregnant with their second baby, Witek is asked by his associate to go abroad in business as his substitute. At the last moment, Witek changes the plane ticket to go via France. The film concludes with the scene of his plane exploding in the sky.

In Blind Chance, the audience sees three versions of Witek’s life and it can be argued that the three Witeks are in a “double” relation to one another, since they represent three different life stories depending on whether Witek catches or misses the fatal train. Each Witek can be considered as an incarnation of the question “what if”? In Witek’s case, what if he succeeds in catching the train, or what if he takes the plane for France? This kind of conditional mode is used in other films by Kieslowski such as Red. In this film, there is a character named Auguste who is a young judge who repeats many events in the life of another character, Joseph (a retired judge). These examples are only to name a few of the doubles that can be found in Kieslowski’s films.
This paper consists of two major parts. Part I is devoted to the examination of Krzysztof Kieslowski's major feature films, The Double Life of Veronique and Three Colours: Blue, White, Red. His earlier works will also be discussed when necessary. Chapter One will examine the issue of doubleness in The Double Life of Veronique, focusing on the doubled relation between Weronika and Veronique as well as on Veronique's boyfriend, Alexandre's interaction within this doubled relationship. The significance of Alexandre's occupation as a puppeteer is considered as part of the argument. The doubleness found in the process of the production is also discussed. Chapter Two will be divided into three sections in order to discuss different types of doubleness in the three works that constitute a trilogy, Three Colours: Blue, White, Red. Chapter Three will consider the doubled relation between the creators and the created of these films, such as the relationship between the characters in those films and the director, musical director or actors who created the works. Part II is about my theatre practice, that is, the scriptwriting and staging of Cul de Sac and Requiem. Cul de Sac was written and staged in 1999, and deals with the main character's self-discovery through encounters with her doubles in her dream. Requiem was produced in the following year and features an integration of classical piano performance as part of a theatrical piece. Here the central issue is the double personality of the main character who is born as a Siamese twin and has created the personality of her dead twin sister inside her mind. The whole thesis deals with the issue of doubleness in order to explore the significance of understanding this subject for a richer comprehension of films and theatre works; for a better understanding of one's own identity; and for acknowledging the connections between people beyond time and space through this mysterious mediation of doubles.
PART I

Chapter 1 The Double Life of Veronique

The Double Life of Veronique is the first French-Polish collaboration directed by Kieslowski, produced by Leonardo de la Fuente in 1991. The screenplay is written by Krzysztof Kieslowski and Krzysztof Piesiewicz and the music is composed and directed by Zbigniew Preisner. The story revolves around Weronika and Veronique, who are identical in their appearance, being both sensitive young women who are highly talented in singing. They are born on the same day, but in different parts of Europe, Weronika in Poland and Veronique in France. The first part of the film presents the life of Weronika in Poland largely focusing on her singing, but also tracing her close relationship with her father and the more ambiguous relationship with her boyfriend, Antek. When she visits her aunt in Krakow, she wins first prize in a singing competition and is offered an opportunity to perform in a concert. However, she has a heart condition that causes her death during the concert. At this moment, the story shifts to the life of Veronique. The Polish part also traces her fond relationship with her father against a less solid connection with her boyfriend, Antek.

The French part begins with Veronique making love in bed. She suddenly feels a sense of grief, without exactly knowing why. Additionally, she somehow senses that singing could endanger her life, although she is very talented in this respect like Weronika. In response, she turns away from a vocal vocation and leads her life as a music teacher in a primary school. One day, a puppet show visits her school and she falls in love with the puppeteer, Alexandre Fabbri. Their relationship begins in a very mysterious manner. At first, she receives a series of enigmatic messages both through an anonymous phone call and by post. She realises that they are from Alexandre, and after a few messages, she goes to Paris to find him. She discovers the puppeteer, as anticipated, learning from him that all his messages were his means of making an experiment on female psychology, in order to research his new book about a heroine who is lured by enigmatic messages. Insulted, she leaves only to be chased by Alexandre to her hotel where, after all, they make love. They spend some time together, until Veronique realises that he continues to take advantage of her life story for his work. In the end, she leaves him and returns to her father.

The lives of Weronika and Veronique hardly intersect in an explicit manner, but many implications in the film suggest that their lives are connected with each other. The
first part of this chapter will be devoted to clarifying the relationship between the two women's lives, and the second part discusses the significance of the puppeteer with respect to the connection between the two women. Thirdly, I will discuss a connection between the story of Alexandre’s puppets and the lives of Weronika and Veronique, as well as a doubled relationship between Weronika/Veronique and some characters in Kieslowski’s other films. Finally, I would like to introduce some doubling situations between an actor's real life and that of a character particularly with respect to the process of producing The Double Life of Veronique.

1.1 Weronika and Veronique

In the summary above, I deliberately did not use the word, “protagonist” to describe the either of the women. This would indeed be one of the starting points to discuss The Double Life of Veronique. That is, who is the main character of the film, The Double Life of Veronique? As Roger Ebert observes in his review of the film, it looks like a story about two young women, Weronika and Veronique. Are they both protagonists? The title names only the latter, which may appear to suggest that Veronique is the core personality and Weronika is her double. However, only the English and French titles, The Double Life of Veronique, and La Double Vie de Veronique, feature “Veronique.” In Polish, they use the name Weronika; Podwojne Zycie Weroniki. Therefore, it does not seem reasonable to base any argument about the predominance of a specific character on the name of one woman or the other. Kieslowski actually struggled to find the right title for this film, having considered a variety of options for the title before he decided on the final language specific title. Titles considered range from “Choir Girl,” “Unfinished Girl” to “The Lonely Together.” If the title were “Choir Girl,” for example, it would not necessarily have referred to Veronique; but could point to both or either of the women, since both women are engaged in singing. If it was “The Lonely Together,” there could have been the same weight on both of the characters as a half of one unity. Kieslowski finally decided on The Double Life of Veronique, for the title seemed to him to be reasonable both in terms of attracting the audience as well as of conveying the contents of the film quite well after viewing the finished product.

Added to the obscure meanings revealed in the process of naming of this film, he says, “The main character’s called Weronika/Veronique.” Why not “The main characters are...”? Does it mean that the main character has two names and two lives,
but nonetheless still is one person? If this was the case then, it would not make sense for Veronique to accidentally take a photo of Weronika. The mystery of this film ultimately remains a mystery. Ebert puts it as follows: “The parts do not quite fit, and anyway this is not a puzzle to be assembled.”\textsuperscript{21} Probably it is not, particularly considering that Kieslowski had prepared several versions of this film if time and money had have allowed him to bring them into realisation.\textsuperscript{22} He even envisaged a version culminating in Veronique going to Krakow and encountering a third double figure.\textsuperscript{23} But it is still fun to play with the puzzle. Or rather it may be something like an endless labyrinth. If you take one path, it leads to other paths that you would not have found if you had not chosen the initial one. Some of the pathways may join together, and some may end up in a cul de sac. You never know what you can discover until you actually take one of the options. For instance, if we assume that Weronika lived only in Veronique’s mind, we can see something that we would not have otherwise, although it may come to a dead end because of the testament of the photo of Weronika taken by Veronique. At the same time, we may find an entrance into another labyrinth along the way.

As the title of \textit{The Double Life of Veronique} suggests, Weronika and Veronique appear to be in some form of double relation to each other. Let us just think what is so similar about them. First of all, they look alike. Indeed, they are played by the same actress, Irene Jacob. In terms of make-up and outfits, Weronika looks conventional, while Veronique appears modern and freer, but the difference is presented only in a subtle way. Other similarities between Weronika and Veronique include the same birth date and the father as the closest family member, for both of their mothers have died. They both have serious heart conditions and both are very talented singers.\textsuperscript{24} Would it be possible to have such a double identity in reality? Eva H. Kissen suggests the possibility of the women being twins who were separated at birth and brought up in different countries. If their deceased mother could possibly be the same person. Neither of the mothers appears on screen, though we hear their voices in the opening sequence. Either one or both of their fathers need not necessarily be their biological father(s), but foster parent(s) who has/have not told the girls the truth of their birth. This issue of biological father is the main question in another film by Kieslowski, \textit{Decalogue 4}. Although this suggestion that Weronika and Veronique are twins could be logically possible, there is no hint about such a connection in the film itself.
Let us look at how Weronika and Veronique’s lives are related to each other and how aware Weronika and Veronique are of each other’s existence. There are many corresponding scenes in their lives, each of which will be examined below. The first scene that suggests Weronika’s sensibility about her double occurs when she is lying beside her boyfriend, Antek. She looks at her close-up, enlarged portrait photo on the window. The picture looks as if it has a separate life because of the reflection of the falling rain. Weronika looks up at the image with an ambiguous expression on her face. It is a slight smile, suggestive of something more than just smiling at her own picture. Maybe she is sensing another life which is deeply implicated in her own, in a relationship far deeper than that which she shares with Antek. For an instant, she experiences a very private moment, although she is physically together with Antek.

Subsequently, there is a mysterious scene which can be taken both as a glimpse of her dream and as that of her reality. She is running with her music folder in bright sunshine, while splashing through puddles here and there. Weronika does not seem to be afraid of getting wet as she runs through puddles without hesitation. This suggestion is heightened when considering an earlier scene where she is the only one of the choigirls who enjoys singing as it begins raining during their rehearsal, since the other choigirls run for shelter under a roof. In the above-mentioned scene, she is running in sunshine after rain for some reason. She may be rushing to rehearsal or she may be late for some other appointment. If it is a dream scene, it can be taken as a symbolic gesture of her time running out. The next scene begins with her waking up with a start. Then she goes to her father who is drawing a picture of a church. She says to her father, “I have a strong feeling. I feel that I’m not alone.” Father asks, “Not alone, how?” “That I’m not alone in the world.” Father says, “You aren’t.” Then she replies, “I don’t know.” A relevant conversation will be held between Veronique and her father later in the film.

Weronika visits her aunt in Krakow in the early stages of the film. The camera captures her sitting by herself on train. Halfway through the journey, she looks up at the camera, in a similar way as she previously had looked up at her photo in her room. What is she looking at? She may just have found something on the ceiling of the train which lies behind the camera or she may be aware of someone looking at her. She may be giving a look back at a particular person amongst the audience who might be her double. After the mysterious glance with the re-occurring smile, Weronika gazes at the landscape passing outside through her small transparent ball which reflects the scenery.
upside down in its round frame. The camera focuses on this inverted scenery, which causes the real image to become blurred in the background. The same sort of contained reflection of a red church on a ball mysteriously reappears in a scene when Veronique is sleeping next to her new boyfriend, Alexandre, in a hotel room. Is she revisioning in her dream what her double saw when she was still alive or is it a reminiscence of what she saw on her way to the Gare Saint-Lazare in Paris or during her trip to Krakow? Veronique has the same kind of transparent plastic ball among the other things she has in common with Weronika such as a lipstick and a ring which she uses to rub her eyelashes, just as Weronika does.

Veronique once looks up at the camera, too, later in the film. The moment takes place after she receives the first mysterious envelope containing a black shoelace that she throws into a shared bin in her apartment. She drifts off to sleep only to be roused by a strong beam of light. She looks out of her window and finds a boy playing with the sun’s reflection. After a while, he stops playing and closes his window. However, Veronique still sees a reflected light on the wall of her room. At this moment, she looks up at the camera. Maybe she is just looking at the light which has gone beyond the camera and, therefore, the audience cannot see what she is looking at. The difference between the reactions of Weronika and Veronique towards the camera in these moments is that Veronique does not smile whereas Weronika did. Rather, Veronique appears to be concerned with this mysterious phenomenon of seeing some reflection of light without any apparent source. Her next reaction is to go back to the bin and pick up the shoelace that she had thrown away.25

Now Veronique looks closely at the shoelace. She holds the lace on a diagram of her heart pulse. The fact that she has such a sheet suggests that she has needed to have her heart checked. She pulls the lace hard and holds it straight, which is a sign for a stopped heart. Then she does the opposite, making waves and squashing the lace. It is the director’s intention to present the image of a shoelace while alluding to her heart condition.26 Weronika plays with a black string, as well. She pulls the string of her music folder, while she sings to the accompaniment of a singing teacher during her audition for the singing competition. The higher the note gets, the stronger she winds the string around her right forefinger. Finally she reaches a stage where she cannot pull the string any stronger and she has no choice but to let it go. When the string springs off her hand, she stops singing. It appears that she may be pushing her heart too hard. She breathes with difficulty towards the end of her singing and, on her way back from the
audition, the first heart attack occurs. She rushes onto a bench. The camera angle rotates as she puts her head down. She sees a man exposing himself to her for a second in her rotated view. This scene is referred to later in this chapter in relation to Alexandre. Then she takes out her lipstick and applies it to her lips. Veronique carries a lipstick with her, too. In a later scene, when Alexandre tells Veronique that he wants to know everything about her, she takes all the things out of her bag and he finds a lipstick among the assorted articles.

Before Weronika goes to the concert for which she has been selected to sing, she sees an old lady from her window. The lady is walking with bags in her both hands. Weronika calls to her from the window saying that she will come down and help her carrying the bags. However, her aunt suggests that she better get dressed because she is standing by the window in her underwear. As a result she does not go and help the lady but gets ready for the concert instead. Veronique sees an old lady, too. During her music class, she looks out of a window of the classroom. This time, the lady is not carrying bags but is just walking away with a cane. Similarly, in Three Colours, the main character in each section of the trilogy comes across an old person trying to put an empty bottle into a recycling bin, a reiterated scene which will be examined in the following chapter.

An indication of Weronika’s relation with her boyfriend is sketched out when she leaves her town for Krakow without directly letting him know about the trip, suggesting that she might not have very close feeling towards him. Antek, however, goes to Krakow to confess his love to her. Weronika notices him following her on a bike through a back window of a bus. When she gets off the bus, Antek tells her that he loves her, a confession to which she does not really respond. He tells her that he is staying in the Holiday Inn, Room 287, if she would like to contact him. This room number turns out to be exactly same as the number of the hotel room in which Veronique stays when she is in Paris. Veronique makes love with Alexandre for the first time in this room, while Weronika does not seem to have visited Antek. She appears more focused on her singing than on her boyfriend, while Veronique’s attention is drawn more towards her new boyfriend. The next scene in which Antek is clearly seen is that of Weronika’s funeral.

Weronika’s funeral is shot from a unique angle, a subjective perspective of the dead, so to speak. The audience is set in the position of a dead body in a coffin in the earth, and those who are attending the funeral drop clods of soil, one by one, on the
transparent cover of the coffin. When the surface of the coffin is covered with soil, the screen blacks out, and Veronique appears in a bedroom scene. All the bedroom scenes in this film are somehow related to the interconnected awareness of Weronika and Veronique towards each other. These scenes show a stronger connection between these two women than their relationships with either of their partners. The cut from the burial scene shows Veronique about reach to her climax, but her gasp of pleasure sounds as if she is suffering from some form of illness. She looks suddenly sad. Her boyfriend with whom she seems to have only a short-term relationship asks, "What's wrong? Are you sad?" She replies, "No. Yes. I don't know why. It's as if I were grieving." "For someone?" "I don't know." She must have sensed the death of her double, but at the same time, she may be grieving for the death of her future self as a singer. In the following scene, she visits her singing teacher to tell him that she plans to stop singing. She cannot explain why, and she does not listen to her teacher who tries to persuade her to continue with her music. After she quits her singing, she finds love in the person of a puppeteer, Alexandre Fabbri. This decision contrasts with Weronika's choice to place priority in her singing rather than with her boyfriend.

Not long after she falls in love with Alexandre, Veronique visits her father. Veronique tells her father frankly, "I'm in love." Then she continues, "Not long ago, I had a strong sensation. I felt that I was alone. All of a sudden." Her father asks her, "Someone disappeared from your life?" She replies, "Yes, that's it. Yet nothing has changed." These words correspond with Weronika's conversation with her father earlier in the film, when she informs him that she is not alone. Also both Weronika and Veronique seem to have close relations with their father. The camera catches their physical attachment to each other as well as their mental closeness. In Poland, Weronika's father comes to her while she is lying down and puts his hand on her cheek without words. Weronika holds his hand on her cheek. Veronique's father holds his daughter's hand in one of the scenes, too. In another scene, they hold their cheeks almost touching each other after greeting kisses. There is also a scene where Veronique's father appears in a bath towel to greet his daughter. These scenes do not imply a sexual intimacy, however, these actions would be possible only if the daughter has a close relationship with her father.

Weronika and Veronique physically come across each other only once in the film. Veronique makes a trip around Europe, and passes through Krakow. When she is about to leave the city, Weronika chances to be in the same place. Weronika is carrying a
music folder with her, and happens to drop it. She collects her music sheets from the ground and, when she stands up, she sees her double getting onto a bus, taking photos. Weronika stares at her from a distance, while Veronique takes pictures of the place and people, including Weronika. Apart from this intersection through a photo, Weronika and Veronique’s connection occurs in a spiritual sphere. The two women basically sense each other’s existence. Ellie Ragland and Elizabeth Wright observe that for Weronika, “singing brings a moment of pure joy in which she feels that she has attained a unity with the ground of her imaginary (bodily) existence.”27 They place importance on the absence of the mother in Weronika and Veronique’s lives, and regard these absences as “the structural cause of the desire of each woman: Each one wants to create through the voice or through singing a feeling of spiritual or affective oneness with something beyond the experience of everyday life.”28

Alexandre has an important role in connecting the lives of Veronique and Weronika. Veronique in particular may not have achieved as much comprehension of her double, if not for the intervention of Alexandre. Although she is intuitive and sensitive, she is not necessarily an acute observer like Alexandre. Not only does she not notice her double staring at her in Krakow but also she fails to realise that there is a picture of her double among the developed photos taken in that city. Only when Alexandre points out the photo of Weronika, thinking that it is Veronique, does Veronique realise what she had found in Krakow. Alexandre, the puppeteer, has an aspect as a manipulator of Veronique, but he also acts as a mediator with respect to the doubled relation between Weronika and Veronique. The following section will examine the significance of the puppeteer to Veronique’s double life.

1.2 Alexandre and Weronika/Veronique

Kieslowski says, at first, that he and his co-scriptwriter, Krzysztof Piesiewicz, had no idea about a profession for Veronique’s boyfriend. The idea came “by chance,” when either Kieslowski or Piesiewicz recalled a Japanese television programme on self-devised puppet theatres which was broadcasted a couple of years previously. They watched through the recordings of the programme and chose Bruce Schwartz, an American puppeteer, to join in their production.29 Kieslowski places significance in the fact that Bruce Schwartz does not cover his hands which manipulate the puppets on stage, which is different from the technique used by many puppeteers. He considered this essential for the film; that is, to show the manipulating hands of Alexandre when he
performs his show in Veronique’s school. However, in contrast to what occurs on stage with the puppet, Alexandre manipulates Veronique by stealth after the show. He does not show his hands while he manipulates her until Veronique discovers his interventions. He sends her a series of mysterious objects anonymously and controls her with elaborate, invisible strings. Until he finishes drawing in these strings, he does not reveal himself to Veronique. She has to find the clues to the message by herself, only to discover that he was just experimenting with her behaviour in order to write his next work. This realisation shocks Veronique who had thought that she had found love. Alexandre apologises for what has occurred and eventually succeeds in establishing a relationship with Veronique.

However, Alexandre does not stop taking advantage of Veronique for his creative work. When he finds the photo of Weronika, he probes Veronique for information about her feelings towards her double and makes use of the story for his next puppet show. He creates two identical female puppets and tells their story to Veronique who recognises the resemblances of the details to those in her own life. He even asks her what to name the character/s. The title of the story would be “The Double Life of ....” Veronique turns her face away from him, probably because she is aware that he not only invaded her private life but also that he has made use of their relationship for his own sake. There seems to be a doubt arising in her about his role as her lover.

Although Alexandre manipulates Veronique and takes advantage of her personal story about her double, at the same time as previously mentioned, he plays an important role in bringing Weronika and Veronique together. Kieslowski himself notes, “Alexandre made her aware that something else exists, that the other Weronika did exist.” He also says, “perhaps he understood what she couldn’t understand herself.” As a result of encountering him, Veronique seems to understand her life better but, at the same time, she finds that Alexandre is not the right partner for her. Kieslowski says, “I think she’s much wiser at the end of the film than at the beginning.”

Annette Insdorf names Alexandre as “Veronique’s guide to another dimension.” Unwittingly in some instances, he encourages Veronique to become more aware of her other self in various ways. Firstly, somehow he has a recording of Weronika’s singing and plays this recording on an anonymous phone call to Veronique late at night. He uses the music for his puppet show as well. The recording of the singing also reappears in a tape that he sends to her at her father’s place later in the film. It remains a mystery as to how he obtained the recording, since he does not seem to know about Weronika until
Veronique tells him about her feelings about her double. The recording of the music played on phone is the first of a series of mysterious messages he sends to her. Insdorf says that she receives “two” mysterious packages on top of the phone call. However, there are actually three packages sent to her. The first one is a shoelace, the second is an empty cigarette box and the third is a cassette recording station noise and part of Weronika’s song. The last one is sent to her father’s place.

Veronique tells Alexandre her story. “This may have nothing to do with it, or it may. All my life I’ve felt I was in two places at the same time. Here and somewhere else. It’s hard to explain. But I know I always feel what I should do.” Then Alexandre finds the photos that Veronique took during her trip around Europe. One of the shots particularly takes his attention. “That’s a beautiful photograph. And you, in the huge coat.” “That’s not me.” “Sure it’s you.” She takes the photo sheet from him to have a closer look. “That’s not my coat.” Then she begins to cry. Why does she cry at this moment, although she did not cry when she first had the feeling that she lost someone? It may be because she realises that her grieving was real.

When she begins to cry, Alexandre kisses her, which leads to a lovemaking scene. While they are making love, she looks at the photo and the magic ball. Afterwards, she looks at the photograph again. Insdorf argues that “because the photo of Weronika is inter-cut with their lovemaking, it seems to include her double.” However, to me it seems more like there is a gap between the experiences of Veronique and those of Alexandre. She seems more concerned with her double figure that she has just discovered than with the sexual experience with him. On the other hand, Alexandre seems to be solely interested in having sex with this mysterious and beautiful girl. He acts as if to console her crying by gently kissing the tears on her cheeks, but his action seems to derive from his own sexual desires rather than from caring about her. Veronique seems at first to wish to evade his shower of kisses and just concentrate on her grief, but eventually she cannot resist her desire for the man in whom she seeks love.

Alexandre’s character as an astute observer leads her to find things about both her double and herself. For example, in the same scene that he finds the photo, he also finds her sunglasses that she thought she had lost a long time ago. He also makes small observations about her before they become lovers. In one instance, Veronique is driving home and is about to light a cigarette, while waiting for a signal to change. Then she hears a horn of a car. She does not pay much attention to it and tries to light her
cigarette again. Then she hears a louder horn. She looks out of the window at the truck next to her car and finds Alexandre gesturing that she is holding her cigarette the wrong way around. It is nighttime and dark in her car, so he must have been watching her very closely to perceive that the cigarette was being held the wrong way around. On the other hand, she does not recognise Alexandre until he moves so that she notices the picture of a large butterfly on the side panel of his truck, which she associates with the puppeteer. He is a good listener, too. When he is with Veronique, he asks questions and listens to her responses, rather than talking to her about himself. In fact, the audience does not get much information about him except that he is a puppeteer who has published books.

Towards the end of the film, there is a scene where Veronique wakes up at Alexandre’s place on her own. Alexandre has already left to work in his studio. Veronique goes to see him through a dark corridor which leads to his room. Here the same melody as Weronika sang appears to dominate the scene, this time with a flute playing the theme, as if to act as a prelude to her encounter with the puppets of her two selves in the following scene. When Veronique finds that Alexandre has made not only one but two puppets in her image, her face changes from brightness to suspicion. His mind is on his work with these two marionettes and he does not notice the change in her expression. He reads his - rather her - story to her: “November 23, 1966 was the most important day of their lives. That day at three in the morning, they were born in two different cities on two different continents. They both had dark hair and brownish-green eyes. When they were two years old and already knew how to walk, one of them burned her hand on a stove. A few days later the other one reached out to touch the stove but pulled out just in time. And yet, she could not have known that she was about to burn herself. Do you like it? I think I’ll call it ‘The Double Life of...’ I haven’t yet decided what names to give them.” He looks at Veronique as if to ask for her advice about their names. She is his creative source. Veronique leaves the room and him, without a word.

Veronique, subsequently, goes to her father’s place. Here the music of Weronika that Alexandre once sent her appears again. Is the song from the radio, from Veronique’s mind, or from her father’s memory, or does it occur simultaneously in both Veronique and her father’s minds? Her father raises his head, when the music surfaces and Veronique touches a tree. Insdorf suggests that there is a connection between this scene with a couple of previous scenes related to trees and leaves. One of them occurs in the opening scene where a little girl is looking at a green leaf through a magnifying glass. The time is in spring and the girl is the two-year old Veronique. The previous
scene is that of Weronika looking up at the stars on a winter’s night. Insdorf suggests that these scenes can be read as proof of Weronika’s experiences preceding Veronique’s, since the Weronika’s scene is in winter, almost Christmas Eve, in 1968, and Veronique’s scene is in spring in 1968. However, if the former scene takes place in Christmas time, which means around the end of a year, would it not mean that the springtime in France comes earlier than that? Here the more significant point seems to be the association of each of the seasons chosen for little Weronika and Veronique: the former with winter which is associated with death, and the latter with spring which is a time of birth / rebirth and transformation.

The other point to which Insdorf pays attention in the opening scene is the focus given to the act of looking, a characteristic of many other scenes in the film. Both the mothers of Weronika and Veronique lead their daughters to be “aware of the physical world.” The interesting thing is that in the scene in France, Veronique’s mother shows the girl a big green leaf, saying, “Here’s the first leaf,” but what the audience actually sees is an enlarged eye of the girl looking at the leaf through a magnifying glass. That is, the audience is looking at the girl from the opposite side of the glass. Similar camera work can be found in A Short Film about Love. The main character, Tomek, peeps into one of his neighbour’s apartment and the screen introduces a voyeurism from the opposite side of his telescope, so we see his observing eye at one stage, rather than looking only at the objects of his peeping. There are some scenes with the opposite sort of camera work in The Double Life of Veronique. In one of the scenes that take place in Poland, Weronika wakes up and goes to see her father drawing a picture. When the camera closes in on him, at first we only see part of his drawing through one of his glasses’ lenses, and the rest of the picture, which is out of the frame of his glasses, looks out of focus at the back. This is similar to the scene when Weronika sees a landscape outside a train window through her magic ball. In both situations, the audience is given the subjective perspective of the characters to some extent and is led to look at the objects under concern in the same manner as the characters, whether through glasses or a round surface of a magic ball.

Paul Coates relates the act of looking to the theme of doubleness in this film: “The film’s almost obsessive interest in viewing scenes through crystal balls, coloured glass and filters finds its necessary thematic echo in the duality of its heroine’s life.” Not only the crystal balls but also photos and reflections seem to contribute to present the image of doubles in this film. In both Poland and France, there are scenes where a photo
seems to gain a life in its own. As is mentioned earlier, in Poland, Weronika once looks at her photo in a way as if she has found someone else in the image of herself. The scene seems to imply that Weronika is sensing the existence of her double. In France, Veronique actually finds her double’s picture, and the more she looks at the photo, the more present her double’s image becomes. Kieslowski’s *A Short Film about Killing* also seems to imbue a photo with a similar kind of function wherein the captured image is suggestive of a personality or a life in itself. The protagonist, Jacek, has a photo of his dead sister, which has creases in the middle. Christopher Garbowski considers that the creases act as “a metaphor of his break with a more innocent past,” and when he leaves the photo at a photo shop for an enlargement, “it is as if he left a part of himself.”

Reflections constitute another place where the image of a double can be suggested. There are many scenes with the protagonists’ reflections in this film. In Poland, when Weronika looks through her magic ball out of a train window, the image is clearly doubled on the window. The reflection may be forecasting that her double, Veronique, also has a similar magic ball standing next to the photo of Weronika later in France. Another instance of reflection appears when Weronika calls her girlfriend in Krakow from a phone stand. Her reflection can be seen on the transparent plastic board of the phone stand. Soon after this scene, Weronika visits this girlfriend who is involved as the accompanist for a chorus rehearsal. Weronika stands beside a wall mirror where we see the reflection of her back. Later in Poland when she is standing at the back of a bus just before she finds Antek following her on his bike, her reflection can be seen on the back window a couple of times depending on the angle of the moving bus.

In France, there is a scene where Veronique goes to a bookstore in search of books written by the puppeteer, Alexandre Fabbri. She finds his books showcased in the window, which reflects her image. Coates points out that this is the only scene with Veronique’s reflection which contrasts with the Polish part of the film abundant in Weronika’s reflections, and he interprets this scene of Veronique’s image doubling on Alexandre’s work as implying the doubling of Veronique and her lover. However, Insdorf notes that in the American version of the film, the ending scene captures Veronique embracing her father in the garden through a window and that this image is doubled. Scientifically, the effect should be due to a reflection of the window with the scenery outside on a mirror inside the house. However, Insdorf interprets it as follows:
"The image is parallel rather than reflected, suggesting two different daughters embracing their fathers."\textsuperscript{40}

Insdorf also points to the ending scene of the other version of the film, where Veronique touches a trunk of a tree at her father’s place, and claims that the act of touching the trunk "suggests that her warm and open character is rooted in the affections of a solid father, as well as an appreciation of terrestrial continuity."\textsuperscript{41} She associates this scene with the one when Weronika has her first heart attack in the street. She gathers dead leaves with her arm as she runs towards a bench to take a rest. This incident occurs not long before she dies from another heart attack. The season associated with Weronika is again winter, or late autumn. On the other hand, there is a scene in the French part of the film that may imply Veronique’s fear of death which is associated with winter or late autumn. Once when Veronique visits her father, he lets her try two kinds of perfume that he has made from plants. Veronique says that she finds one of them more pleasant than the other. Her father explains that the one she likes is from the beginning of autumn, while the other is from its end, which means the approach of winter, the season associated with death.

Veronique has a good understanding with her father. Although they live independently, Veronique seems to visit him quite often, especially when she is facing a significant event in her life. In the film, she goes to his place three times, all of which are related to Alexandre somehow. At first, she visits her father when she falls in love with the puppeteer. She does not see her father the second time she goes to his place. It is late at night and her father is asleep. She just picks up the envelope from the mysterious source which previously she had left after taking its content, a cassette, so that she can see the postmark on the envelope. Finally, she returns to her father, after she has left Alexandre. Kieslowski has made two versions of this ending scene, as is referred to earlier. The American version shows her hugging her father, while the European alternative only suggests her return, capturing the image of Veronique touching a trunk of a tree in her father’s garden.

Coates perceives the relationship between Veronique’s father and Alexandre as another double relation. Coates bases his argument on the scene of Alexandre’s puppet show in Veronique’s primary school. Veronique is seen among the audience of school children, looking directly at Alexandre manipulating the puppets. Coates argues that her gaze is “that of dutiful daughter,” and he, “of course, is a sublimation of the father.”\textsuperscript{42} However, this does not seem very convincing, since Veronique appears rather as a
young woman who is experiencing an attraction for this stranger. Coates also thinks of Alexandre as "the superego, the French extension, of the dirty old man Weronika sees in the park." Coates refers to the man who exposes himself briefly in front of Weronika when she is first struck by a heart attack. However, he does not give enough support for his argument, only mentioning that the duality was clearer in the original screenplay. The double relation between the puppeteer and Kieslowski, cited by many critics including Coates, is more convincing. This relationship will be further examined in Chapter Three.

1.3 Various Doubles of Weronika / Veronique

In this section, I would like to consider different kinds of doubles of Weronika and Veronique by examining not only The Double Life of Veronique but also comparing the work with other Kieslowski films. The puppets in the film provide an interesting variation in the discussion of doubles. There are two puppet stories created by Alexandre in the film: one is the dancer-to-butterfly show that he performs in Veronique's school and the other is his most recent work about a double life of two identical puppets, created through his interaction with Veronique. While the latter seems to repeat Weronika and Veronique's lives, based on the information that Alexandre has gained from Veronique, the former seems to symbolise the essential relationship between the two central characters. The show is about a ballerina who comes out of a closed box to dance and seems to pass away in the middle of her dancing, only to metamorphose into a butterfly. As Insdorf points out, it is not clear whether the dancer dies or not and, in fact, Veronique says she had just broken her leg. However, this comment does not mean that she really believes it to be so. Rather she seems to be afraid of admitting the ballerina's death, perhaps because she associates the story with her own fate or with that of her double whose death she senses by intuition. Insdorf poses a question: "Is Veronique able to fly precisely because Weronika falls?" She expands the question farther, asking whether people generally perhaps have doubles who sacrifice themselves in order that others survive, or whether some of us could be the double for another in reverse. The ballerina's fate reflects that of Weronika whose life revolves around music and who passes away at the height of her performance. Maybe she became a metaphorical butterfly when she lost her voice and fled to Veronique to let her know of the fatality possibly involved in her singing career? The fact that the music that Weronika sang before her death surfaces when the ballerina
revives as a butterfly seems to reinforce this argument about the special connection between the fate of the puppet ballerina and the butterfly and that of Weronika and Veronique.

Coates considers that Veronique is a puppet in a metaphorical sense. He regards Veronique as “the passive object of sound, the doll manipulated by a puppeteer.” In fact, the film never shows Veronique singing, which contrasts with the scenes of Weronika where her singing image appears predominantly. We know that Veronique is a great singer from the context. However, since she decides to cease singing soon after we see her, we do not have an opportunity to hear her sing. As Coates points out, Veronique rather becomes an audience of Weronika’s singing whose recording is introduced to her by Alexandre. It is also acceptable to call Veronique the doll of the puppeteer to some extent, for she is really manipulated by his scheme to experiment on female psychology through his series of mysterious messages. Coates cites the director’s comment on Weronika as having “abused her talent” and, in contrast, he says, Veronique “buries hers.” Coates notes: “She is Weronika reproduced as a doll; she survives, yet not fully alive.” However, she seems to gain an independent strength when she sees Alexandre with the two puppets designed on her towards the end of the film. At this moment, she expresses disgust with the man whom she thought she had loved, for manipulating her and using her private story. She seems to come to a painful realisation that he has treated her like a puppet. Veronique grows out of being a doll finally, as Kieslowski himself acknowledges in remarking on her attainment of wisdom.

The other doubles that I would like to mention are those in other films by Kieslowski, namely, Valentine in Red and Ola in Decalogue 9. There are significant differences between Weronika and Veronique, despite the similarities mentioned earlier, so as to make them be understood as two different people. Firstly, Weronika lives in Poland and Veronique in France; they have different parents, or at least fathers; and the former chooses to continue her music and subsequently dies, while the latter survives as a music teacher instead of a singer. The last point seems to clarify the difference in their personality. It is true that Weronika may simply not have anticipated that pursuing a singing career would be so fatal. If she had have known, she might have chosen another career. However, even after the scene when she suffers from a sudden pain in the heart, she does not show any hesitation in continuing to sing. It may even be possible to say that Weronika is more sincere about her passion, since she devoted her life to it,
whereas Veronique chooses to protect her life by giving up singing. Maybe Weronika and Veronique are not so similar as they appear to be. Each of them might have some other person who is closer to them in terms of temperament and, though lacking in any physical resemblance, may lead a similar kind of life. That is, the similarity required to be someone’s double does not necessarily lie with appearance.

As far as the appearance goes, Valentine in *Three Colours: Red* could be seen as Weronika and Veronique’s other double, for the character is played by the same actress, Irene Jacob. If there is any essential commonality in the lives of Weronika, Veronique, and Valentine, apart from being identical in appearance, it lies in the fact that they all love the music of Van der Budenmajer and also that they all have a connection with the performing arts, although unlike Weronika and Veronique, Valentine is not a musician but a dancer. There is a scene in *Red* where Valentine is engaged in a ballet class. It is not clear how much passion she has for dancing, but, when the camera captures her pushing herself to her physical edge, arching her back towards the ground, the effect of intention shown is associated with Weronika doing more than her best in her singing. Valentine experiences a painful loss of breath, which is reminiscent of Weronika experiencing chest pains during her singing. However, as far as the essential problem in life is concerned, Ola in *Decalogue 9* seems to have closer relationship with Weronika and Veronique.

Ola bears no resemblance in appearance to Weronika and Veronique. But she is a beautiful singer and suffers from a heart problem, just like the two women in *The Double Life of Veronique*. The connection between these three characters is noted by Insdorf: “The two heroines are obviously an elaboration of Ola, the secondary character in *Decalogue 9* who chooses risky heart surgery in order to sing.” Kieslowski, himself, actually admits that he got the idea of Weronika and Veronique’s profession as a singer from Ola’s character. The distinguishing factor about Ola is that she is actually diagnosed with a heart problem that prevents her from pursuing her career as a singer. Moreover, she is given the option of undertaking a heart operation not as a matter of life or death but to enable her to continue her singing career. She decides to take the risk of having an operation. Her case can be seen as another potential life-choice for Weronika and/or Veronique. All these women have heart conditions that can be fatal if they continue singing. What they decide when faced with this dilemma produces different results depending on how much they know about their problem and what they want most in life. We do not even have to look at them as totally different
characters but, in a sense, as the potential lives of one person. For example, Ola in Decalogue 9 presents an example of a solution to the shared problem, if Weronika or Veronique had known about or had been given an option of undergoing a heart operation for the pursuit of their singing career.

It is interesting to note that Kieslowski actually had an idea of creating a third Veronique within The Double Life of Veronique. In that unrealised version of the film, he was thinking of culminating the film with Veronique’s return to Krakow where she finds her “third” double. This “third” double’s life could have been something close to that of Ola, who overcomes her physical problem and pursues her singing, in contrast with Weronika who dies in the midst of her career, and Veronique, who gives up her passion in order to survive. Only Ola achieves both life and art. However, Ragland and Wright imply that Veronique, as well as Weronika, dies at the end of the film. The interpretation is based on the last scene, when Veronique visits her father: “her hand on the bell push suddenly rigidifies and drops.” However, this scene is only in the American edition of the film, whereas the other version ends with her hand placed on a trunk in her father’s garden, which does not seem to bear the slightest implication of her death. Considering what happens beforehand, when Veronique leaves Alexandre with a strengthened resolve, it seems to me more natural to see the film’s ending in a positive light.

1.4 Doubling Involved in the Process of the Production

The Double Life of Veronique seems to have had various doubling already in the process of its production particularly in terms of the relationship between actors or prospective actors and their characters in the film. Kieslowski reveals many interesting anecdotes about the background of casting for The Double Life of Veronique in his Kieslowski on Kieslowski. For example, for the leading role, at first he had in mind an American actress, Andie MacDowell. She agreed to play the role and the agent accepted the contract, too, despite the fact that they would get only half of the money that they had originally requested. However, Kieslowski’s producer thought that the verbal agreement would be enough and postponed signing in the contract. As a result, Andie MacDowell was offered a big production which she accepted. However, Kieslowski says that he was happy about the change of the cast after all, for by that time, he had realised that he should use a French actress for a French film. He decided on Irene Jacob to play the heroine. He remembered her from Au Revoir, Les Enfants by Louis Malle.
He also found that Andie MacDowell, who was thirty at the time, would have been too old for the role, for it turned out that the character should be younger than he had planned at first, through working with Irene Jacob who was twenty-four at the time.

The casting for the heroine’s partner also faced a change. Kieslowski had wanted an Italian director, Nanni Moretti, to play the role. Moretti usually plays leading roles only in his films though, as an exception, he had agreed to perform the role for Kieslowski. They had a meeting and arranged the dates and the sort of jacket for his character, which Kieslowski says, happened to be his own jacket. Unfortunately, he became ill and Kieslowski had to replace the actor. He chose a French actor, Philippe Volter, for the role, whom Kieslowski chooses again in his casting for Blue as a real estate agent. If Moretti had not become ill, then he would have performed Alexandre, and if Kieslowski’s producer had signed a contract with Andie MacDowell, she would have become Weronika and Veronique. Both of them would have created performances very different from the characters that Philippe Volter and Irene Jacob achieved. The visions of these unrealised characters seem to add an image of ghostly doubles to this film about a “double life.” Kieslowski says that: “I imagined that anybody could play the girl.”52 The openness of the main character may have offered the audience freedom, to a certain extent, in imagining their own version of Weronika or Veronique.

Another episode during the auditioning for the cast of The Double Life of Veronique reveals a doubling between the real life of a prospective actor and his role in the film. When Kieslowski was auditioning an actor for the role of the physical education teacher in Veronique’s school, a very tall, handsome actor came along. He read part of the script and Kieslowski found him to be an able actor. The man asked if the role was to be a physical education teacher. Kieslowski informed him that the role concerned was a physical education teacher from a country town and that they were planning to shoot it in Clermont Ferrand. The man smiled, and when asked for the reason, he replied, “I was a PE teacher in a school in Clermont Ferrand for three years.”53 Unfortunately, he proved to be too tall for the role. A similar coincidence occurred, while Kieslowski was looking for an actor for a music teacher. An old actor came along right after the physical education teacher. Kieslowski asked him if he had had anything to do with the music. The man replied, “I’m a conductor by profession and I was the director of the Opera in Marseilles for ten years.” With these coincidences, Kieslowski thought that the film must work.54
There is another coincidence during the organisation of the film. The case is similar to the one where Nanni Moretti turned out to have a jacket that would have been suitable for his role in the film. This time it is not about an actor but about a puppet. When they contacted the puppeteer, Bruce Schwartz, to ask him to take charge of the puppet show in the film, they discovered that he already had most of the puppets that were required for the film. When they explained him that there would be a puppet show about a ballerina who broke her legs, it turned out that he already had a puppet of ballerina. Schwartz suggested inventing a story with a butterfly in it, for he also had a puppet of butterfly. The only puppet that he had to add to his collection especially for this film was that of Irene Jacob. Kieslowski makes mixed use of singularity and plurality for the heroine again: “He made one more puppet of Irene Jacob . . . for the last scene; that is, he made two puppets of her.” As the fate of Weronika and Veronique within the story, these puppets of Weronika and Veronique were not to stay together in the real world: the production and Bruce Schwartz have made a contract between them which says that they will keep a puppet each.

From all these coincidences that occurred during the organisation of the filming, the creation of *The Double Life of Veronique* seems to have already been set from long before Kieslowski started to write down the script. The coincidences appear to be associated with his words on music: “Music notes all exist, waiting for someone to order them.” Various parts of the film’s composition may have been waiting for the director simply to organise them into a meaningful whole.

In this chapter, we have seen various kinds of doubles through examining *The Double Life of Veronique*: the doubled relation extends between and beyond the two major characters in the film, to protagonists in other works and to the evocative storytelling of the puppets. Alexandre’s role in the relationship between the two heroines as well as his double relation with Veronique’s father have also been examined. The following chapter discusses doubleness in relation to the question of the significance of the past in one’s present life through analysing *Three Colours: Blue, White, Red*, a work created by Kieslowski after *The Double Life of Veronique*. 
Three Colours: Blue, White, Red

Three Colours: Blue, White, Red is named after the colours of the French Flag. The trilogy examines the meaning of the ideals of the French Revolution, liberty, equality, fraternity on a personal level and within the contexts of modern society. Although the trilogy may appear to have political intentions, the director emphasises that he is only interested in the lives of individual people and not in political organisations or ideologies. In one of his interviews, when asked about the influence of his experience of living in France to the understanding of his treatment of the issue of liberty in the film, Blue, he comments as follows: “No, because this film, like the other two, has nothing to do with politics. I’m talking about interior liberty. If I wanted to talk about exterior liberty -- liberty of movement -- I would have chosen Poland. . . . But interior liberty is universal.”

Blue was shot from September to November in 1992, and White and Red were filmed by May in 1993. The screenplay is a collaboration between Krzysztof Kieslowski and his long-term co-writer, Krzysztof Piesiewicz, and the musical director is again Zbigniew Preisner who had joined in Kieslowski’s filmmaking since No End produced in 1984. Each of the three films is an independent creation: they are created intentionally with a different cinematographer and the stories revolve around different protagonists. Kieslowski himself underlines the individuality of these three films, placing little importance on the connections between them. In the following chapter, I would like to examine the films separately to clarify the characteristics of the theme of doubleness in each of them.

2.1 Blue

Blue is about a young widow named Julie who loses her husband and daughter in a car accident at the beginning of the story. The film traces her struggle in the face of the drastic changes brought about by the accident. After trying to sever all connections with her past, Julie gradually reconciles herself with the tragedy and recovers herself, her love and passion. Her husband, Patrice, was a famous composer, who had been composing music for the unification of Europe before his death. Julie seems to have been helping her husband with his composition and it is suggested in the film that she may have been an editor of his music or even a hidden composer behind Patrice. It is not clear to what
extent she helped her partner. However, the film shows that, at least, she is familiar with the work of correcting compositions. Patrice had an assistant named Olivier who has been in love with Julie. Before she leaves the house in a suburb of Paris where she had been living with her family, she calls Olivier and they make love. The next morning, she abruptly leaves him and begins to lead a new, anonymous life in the city of Paris.

Julie thinks that she has cut all her connections with the past and, yet, occasionally she hears a recurring segment of music from Patrice’s unfinished work, which drags her back towards her past. Likewise, Olivier refuses to leave her alone, challenging her attitude towards life by announcing his intention to complete Patrice’s unfinished score. When Julie learns about Olivier’s plan, she also discovers that her husband had a mistress. She tries unsuccessfully to convince Olivier not to proceed with his intentions and also goes to see the mistress, finding her pregnant with Patrice’s baby. Another change in her life occurs through forming a friendship with her new neighbour, Lucille, a professional stripper. All these events eventually contribute to Julie’s growing ability to overcome the past, rather than trying to ignore it. As a consequence, she begins to work on music again, and accepts Olivier’s love.

Kieslowski reveals in Kieslowski on Kieslowski that “Blue is about liberty, the imperfections of human liberty.” He poses a question of “How far are we really free?” through presenting the protagonist’s ostensible freedom and her illusions about the concept. Julie is very free in a way that she has enough money to survive, so that she does not have to restrict her time on labours to survive. She is also free from any housekeeping business. She frees herself from past relationships and does not tell anyone of the particulars of her new address. In Kieslowski on Kieslowski, while discussing his work, Decalogue, Kieslowski mentions the issue of freedom again: “I believe we are not free. . . . We’re always trying to find a way out. But we’re constantly imprisoned by our passions and feelings.” In Julie’s case, she becomes caught up with her fear of mice, her jealousy of her husband’s pregnant mistress or with her impossible attempts to free herself from everything that had contributed to her former identity.

In this section, I would like to examine the transformation of the main character, Julie, pinpointing a kind of doubled relation between the Julie of the past and the Julie in the present. There is also a doubled image between the baby mice in her flat and the foetus in Patrice’s mistress. Julie suffers from a fear of mice, a childhood fear which she had forgotten about. This fear, however, is intertwined with an adult fear of infidelity. The mistress’s baby is also seen as a double of Patrice. Moreover, there is a striking
similarity between the relationship of Patrice and his assistant, Olivier, and that of Kieslowski and his co-scriptwriter, Piesiewicz, which will lead to the discussion of the doubles between the creators and the created in Chapter Three. Music is another key to comprehending this film. Some critics even suggest that the music seems to have some physicality like a ghost, owing to the way in which the music is presented in the film. Hence, some part of this section is devoted to analysing the role of music as a mediator between the Julie of the past and Julie in the present.

Insdorf points out that, as in Red, Blue begins with sounds, which precedes the picture of the sounds' source. We hear the sound of a car driving on a highway and subsequently see a close-up of the tyre of a car running fast on a grey road. Then the camera moves on to focus on a girl sitting at the back of the vehicle carefully hiding the faces of the other two companions in the car, Patrice and Julie. We see Patrice's back and hear Julie's voice. This deliberate framing is consistent throughout the film as Patrice's face only appears on photos, although his name is mentioned numerous times throughout the narrative. Before long, the screen reveals a young man playing with a cup and ball. He keeps trying to put the ball in the cup without succeeding. After a few more attempts, he finally puts the ball in the cup, his face lighting up with a big smile. Shortly afterwards, we hear the sounds of a car crash. These segments seem to represent how accidental life is, picking up on one of the recurring themes of Kieslowski's films. It is all by chance that the car crashed against a tree, that the boy succeeded in the game just before the accident and that the boy was there beside the road when the accident happened.

The viewers do not really know what Julie was like before the car accident, since the screen hardly shows her at the very beginning of the film before the accident occurs. In contrast, soon after the scene of the car crash, we see Julie in an extreme close up as she is lying in a hospital bed. We learn about Julie's past only through Julie's present life. There are flashbacks in the film but these clues to the protagonist's past only occur in the form of music and, thus, we are unable to see what she was like visually, as is the common form of flashbacks in films. As Kieslowski reveals later in his autobiographical writing, Kieslowski on Kieslowski, the witness, Antoine, plays the important role of a mediator between the present Julie and the Julie in the past. As he says, only through Antoine, are we able to know something that we have not been shown. Firstly, he leads Julie to reveal Patrice's personal habit of always repeating the punch line twice when he makes a joke. This is a new and rare piece of information
about Patrice, for otherwise the viewers are only informed that he was a well-known composer who had a mistress. The other important thing to emerge during the meeting of Antoine and Julie is that she laughs for the first time in the film, indicating as Kieslowski notes that, “when she’s with Antoine we see that she used to laugh.”

Intertextually, a car accident occurs also in The Double Life of Veronique. When Alexandre is recording the sounds around him in one of the cafes in a station in Paris, he happens to record the sound of a car crash in front of the cafe. We hear it through the recording sent to Veronique, when she plays the tape. Later on when visiting the station, Veronique witnesses a crashed car being removed. In this film, the relationship of the accident to the protagonist merely indicates that she is gathering more clues in order to find the person who has sent her various enigmatic messages and who, she imagines, will be her future lover. In contrast, the accident in Blue forms the basis for the whole drama of the film. There must be as much drama for the family or someone close to the victim of the crash in The Double Life of Veronique, too: it is just that the focus in Blue is on the crash and its immediate consequences whereas in The Double Life of Veronique, the crash is of secondary significance. Kieslowski seems to present this shift of focus on purpose at times. For instance in Blue, there is a scene where Julie goes to the court in Paris to find her late husband’s girlfriend, Sandrine. The scene takes place in the same location and at the same time as an incident in the beginning of White, when Karol and Dominique are under examination. Sandrine is at work as Dominique’s lawyer. In the film, Blue, the screen shows Julie peeping into the courtroom, trying to enter but being prohibited by a guard. We hear Karol’s voice defending himself. Karol, Dominique and Sandrine are all captured briefly at the front of the room in a long shot from Julie’s perspective outside the entrance. This perspective is reversed in White, where the same courtroom scene is filmed so as to capture the legal processes taking place at the front of the room, enabling the spectator to catch a glimpse of Julie looking for Sandrine from Karol’s viewpoint.

The Decalogue series applies the same methodology throughout its episodes. All of the ten stories take place in the same apartment complex, though each story focuses on different resident(s) as the main character(s). We sometimes see someone from another episode briefly appear on the screen. For example, in Decalogue 6, when Tomek is distributing milk early in the morning, he comes across Roman from Decalogue 9 at the front door of one of the buildings. Roman is in his sports gear with his bicycle, on which he attempts a suicide in his episode. He exchanges greetings with
the milkman. Decalogue 8 adopts a more elaborate way of relating to other episode in the same series. The main character, Zophia, is a professor of philosophy. One day, during her class, a student raises an ethical argument about a woman who is facing an abortion because of her adulterous behaviour while her husband has been in hospital. She had not conceived with her husband and this incident perhaps provides her with the only chance to have a child. She asks her husband’s doctor, who is one of her neighbours, if her husband is likely to survive or not, since the answer will have bearings on her decision about the baby. The story is that of the heroine in Decalogue 2. Later in Decalogue 8, Zophia tells her visitor, Elzbieta, who is from the United States and had participated in her class, that the story was about her neighbours in the same apartment complex.

In returning to Blue, I would like to examine Julie’s decision to start a new life when she emerges from the hospital. She arranges the sale of the house that she had shared with her husband and daughter, in order to erase all reminders of her past family life. She also organises for her mother to be cared for in a nursing home and obtains a little apartment for herself in the middle of Paris. James M. Wall uses the word, “disappearing,” to describe Julie’s reaction to the recent trauma. It is different from “moving” or “changing.” Roger Ebert uses the word, “anonymous,” in the same context. He says, “She . . . moves to the centre of Paris, to what she hopes is an anonymous apartment on an anonymous street.” Wall also describes the first stage that she goes through after the disaster as “stupor of grief.” It seems to me that an opposite explanation may be necessary, because Julie seems to be highly aware of what she is doing. The actions she makes at this stage appear to be fairly decisive. By contrast, she looks unsure about herself when Olivier announces later in the film that he will not be requiring her assistance any more to correct his score. I would suggest that she appears to choose one set of directions with her reason, but something external to her plans draws her in an opposite direction. Richard Corliss mentions the trap initiated by her highly conscious scheme. He cites Julie’s words first: “I don’t want any love, memories, belongings. Those are traps.” Then he points out that, “It takes her the length of the film to realise that isolation is the deadliest snare, that the only release is art and passion.” The concept of a hole in an artificial life plan reappears in White, which will be examined in the next section. Kieslowski may be pointing out that life is not something that we can control through rationally devised planning.
Julie appears at pains to prove that she is not attached to any activity. She seems to need to say it aloud to other people in order to convince herself. At the real estate office, when asked for her occupation, she replies that she does nothing. She repeats the same words to her mother, this time, without being asked. It sounds more like a declaration of her ideal than a description of how she actually is. It would be natural to think of death, if someone wants nothing from life. In fact, she attempts to kill herself in the aftermath of the accident, while she is still in the hospital. She breaks a window in order to distract the attention of a nurse nearby and sneaks into a room where medicine is stored. She takes a jar of pills and places the entire contents into her mouth, but she regurgitates the pills out on her hand instead of swallowing them. When she finds the nurse glancing at her, she says, “I can’t do it. I can’t.” Then she confesses that she has broken the window. The nurse replies, “It’s all right.” Julie does not seem to be listening to her, and says, “I’m sorry.” The nurse tries to console her by saying, “It can be replaced.” This line sounds ironical in the context of a woman who tried to commit suicide for something which could not be replaced, her family. Insdorf suggests that Julie’s reaction is simply as follows: “Unable to end her life, she at least puts an end to her past.” She cuts almost all the connections with her past life with her husband and daughter. She refuses to be interviewed; she organises to sell their house and possessions; she throws away Patrice’s latest composition; and she moves into an apartment without letting anyone know about the new address. When she visits her mother, she declares; “From now on, I’ll only do one thing. Nothing. I have no possessions, no memories, no friends, loves or ties.” She seems to talk about herself only to her mother. Her mother asks Julie if she has enough money to make her living, and tells her that it is impossible to reject everything. Julie’s mother reacts with practical advice. However, she is confused about her daughter’s identity. Although Julie’s mother’s past is not revealed in the film, one can imagine that she may have had gone through a stage where she wanted to throw away everything in the past, and may have succeeded: now she does not even recognise her daughter.

Julie appears to execute her plan to cease connections with her past fairly well. However, there are holes in her scheme that she cannot cover. Firstly, she cannot control the affects of other people’s actions on her life. Although Julie herself decides to leave all the musical works including Patrice’s unfinished concerto, Olivier makes a move to proceed with Patrice’s work and announces his decision in an interview on television, which Julie happens to see. He also finds out where Julie is, despite her
concealment of her new address. Julie also cannot dispose of all the property left by her husband and daughter. She discovers that the officer who was in charge of Patrice’s work had taken a copy of his last score in secret, an action which enables Olivier to work on completing the composition. She also finds out that her daughter’s blue chandelier is left in her Blue Room when she had asked Bernard, one of her servants, to remove everything. In consequence, she takes the chandelier with her to her new apartment, instead of throwing it away, as she had intended. She also begins to learn about Patrice’s girlfriend and the baby, which makes her decide to give the house to them, instead of selling it as she had initially planned. Antoine also succeeds in finding Julie through her doctor. As a result, he informs her of particulars about the moment of the car crash which inevitably draws her back to the past. Besides, it becomes clear towards the end of the film that she has not thrown away the note that Patrice left for the finale of his unfinished concerto. This turns out to be the final clue to complete the concerto under the names of Julie and Olivier at the end of the film.

Above all, she cannot control the emergence of the past through the continuous recurrence of the music within her mind. There are occasional flashbacks through the film where the music becomes the only continuing factor, often accompanied by blackouts. Kieslowski himself refers to such moments. “Not only does the music come back to her but time stands still for a moment.” He says that the device is “to convey an extremely subjective point of view.” The time passes, except for Julie who experiences time stopping for a moment. She cannot tell what is going on around her during the fade-outs. The music and her past take over without her being able to control them, cutting her connection with her present life. A couple of times, it happens when she is with another character. Her interaction with these characters is interrupted momentarily for reasons that are only explicable to Julie. The following are the scenes of the flashbacks. The first flashback occurs when she is having a nap on a chair in the hospital. She suddenly hears fragments of music from the last and unfinished composition by Patrice with a vision of a blue light. An interviewer comes into the room and says, “Bonjour.” Then there is a black screen before Julie replies, “Bonjour.” In response to Julie’s refusal to take part in an interview, the reporter says, “You’ve changed. You used to be nicer.” Julie coldly replies, “Didn’t you hear that my husband and daughter died in a car accident?” In one way, she has not changed at all. Why was she “nicer” to the reporter before? It is because she had a good reason to be like that.
Now the whole circumstances have changed, and her reason to behave negatively is a logical extension of her previous behaviour.

Another flashback appears at night, when she locks herself out of her apartment. She sits on the steps in front of her room, and it is then that she hears the music re-emerging. There is a reflection of blue light on her face and shoulders, but this time there is no blackout. She hears the music again when Antoine, the witness of the car accident, meets her and shows her a chain with a cross. It is probably a gift from Patrice, for later, the audience as well as Julie discovers that his girlfriend is wearing an identical necklace to that which Julie had formerly worn. Antoine tries to talk to her, but Julie refuses to hear about the accident that he witnessed. Now she experiences a moment of the music re-occurring. This time she might have anticipated that the flashback would occur, and that perhaps explains why she refuses to listen to him. Initially, she even refuses to meet him. Julie has a further blackout with music, when Olivier asks her what she wants to do with Patrice’s mistress. Only after the black out, can she reply that she wants to see her.

The music, which accompanies these flashbacks, seems to connect the dual layers of Julie’s life which consists of her previous life and her present life. She tries to control her life by consciously rejecting her past so that she can launch a new life. However, this disjunction is only possible on a material level, such as by moving into a new apartment or by disposing of her daughter and husband’s property. No matter how much she tries, she cannot control the rise of music in her mind since it issues from her unconscious. On one occasion, she tries to shut out the music with the help of a material intervention. She is at the pool and, as she surfaces from the water, the music strikes her again. She goes back into the water to obtain the barrier of water, although the strategy does not seem to work very well. The music visits her like a ghost from her past, which is impossible to seize. Geoff Andrew suggests that in the scene where the music segments occurs to her mind for the first time in the hospital, it looks “as if the music itself were a (blue?) physical presence,” for the musical fragments are accompanied by an inexplicable appearance of a blue light.73

The crucial moment that changes Julie’s attitude towards her past accidentally arises when she visits her new girlfriend, Lucille, at her strip bar one night. A television in the bar happens to be showing a programme about Olivier’s announcement to finish Patrice’s unfinished concerto. It is possible that Julie would never have known about Olivier’s project as such as well as Patrice’s mistress, if she had been reluctant to visit
Lucille at the bar at midnight for, as it is revealed in her conversation with her mother, she does not watch television. While in conversation with Julie, Lucille stares at something beyond the screen. It appears as if she is looking down at the audience of the strip show, so when she says, “Julie... Is that you over there?” some viewers may have the sensation that this film begins to approach the mysterious sphere of The Double Life of Veronique. But then the camera shows a television screen in the distance, where Olivier is being interviewed about Patrice and his unfinished composition. Julie appears in historical clips from the composer’s life. It is no wonder that Lucille is unsure if it is Julie or not, for Julie has concealed her past including the accident, and has changed physically since the image captured was shot just after the accident.

Finding her own image, Julie replies, “It’s me...” She is virtually talking to herself, for Lucille has already left for her show. Besides, Julie does not seem to care about anything except for the television programme which reveals that the European Council has asked Olivier to finish the concerto initially commissioned to Patrice. It also reveals some pictures of Patrice with a young woman who is a stranger to Julie. Now she takes very prompt actions to get to know the things around her which she has not known. Her past life finally attracts her attention. In the same night, she visits a woman who was in charge of Patrice’s score. Earlier in the film, Julie had regained the score from her and had thrown it away. However, the woman had secretly made a copy of the score, which enabled Olivier to succeed with the composition. The next day she pursues Olivier to ask about his project and the young woman in the photos. For the first time she is chasing him and not vice versa. She also finds out from him that her husband had a long-time liaison with the young woman, Sandrine. Olivier had discovered her photos in Patrice’s file. He kept the file that Julie had refused to accept. She goes to the court where Sandrine is working as a lawyer. At first, Julie stares at a young lady standing at the front of the court. It is no wonder that Julie is not sure of Sandrine’s appearance, for she has seen her only in photos. After observing the young lady for a while, she concludes that she is mistaken. She walks farther into the court and finds Sandrine who is about to go into a courtroom to defend Dominique against Karol in White as mentioned above. It is interesting to see how Kieslowski draws attention to our daily life’s confusion about people’s identity.

One of the requirements on which Julie insists in the real estate office when she is seeking a new apartment is that there are no children living in the same building. She moves into an apartment which suits her requirement. However, after a while, she goes
back to the real estate agent and asks for another place, because she is scared of the squeaking noise of mice in her unit. Insdorf suggests that Julie’s fear about the mice might be more to do with babies than with animals, associating the noise of baby mice with the squeals of a group of little girls who once jumped into the pool when she was swimming. It is also possible that the fear of mice is not only associated with her daughter’s death but also with Sandrine’s pregnancy due to her affair with Patrice. In the pool scene, her face becomes blank in contrast with the vivid joy of the girls in the background. The happier the girls appear, the more painful the experience must be for her, for it would unavoidably raise the emotional loss of her daughter. As a child, she was scared of mice. She clarifies her vague memory of her childhood phobia by questioning her mother. Why has the fear suddenly come back? It seems to derive from her doubled shock to learn that Patrice’s mistress is pregnant with his child, not long after she has lost her only daughter, Anna. The mouse in her unit has just had babies, too, which must remind Julie of both her daughter’s death and her husband’s deceit. The x-ray of the foetus in the girlfriend’s womb appears to be doubled with the image of a baby mouse.

Because the agent tells her that there is no alternative accommodation available, she tries to get over her problem. Consequently, she decides to kill the mice. She rents a cat from a downstairs’ neighbour and leaves it in her room. She goes to a swimming pool and experiences a flashback accompanied by music, mentioned earlier. When her girlfriend, Lucille, finds her in the pool, Julie is crying. This is the first time that she cries in the film. Julie explains what she has done to the mice. Although this is the only time that her emotion penetrates the wall she has built to separate her from the past, she insistently refuses to reveal the depth of her fear and sadness, and blurs it with the superficial incident with the mice and a cat.

Lucille plays a significant part in helping Julie recover. Although she does not know anything concrete about Julie’s past, she senses that something disastrous has occurred in Julie’s life. She becomes Julie’s first and only friend in the new life. She helps Julie to maintain connections with the outside world in her intentionally isolated life, and is willing to support her when she is in trouble without invading her privacy. Geoff Andrew argues that Lucille may be representing “a surrogate daughter-figure” for Julie. He finds one implication in that Lucille is “arguably the film’s most ‘innocent’ character in so far as, like a child, she happily goes about without underwear and naively believes that anyone would, like her, enjoy exposing their naked body to the
public gaze.” He also points to the fact that Lucille, on finding a blue chandelier in Julie’s apartment, claims that she had such a thing as a child. However, this argument is hard to support. Firstly, although little children may not be shy about being naked in public, they do not seem to be aware of that state, while strippers take off their clothes on purpose. Secondly, the fact that Lucille recognises Julie’s daughter’s chandelier as something from her childhood past proves that she is no more a child.

Olivier is a contrastive character to Lucille in that he drags Julie out of the vacancy of her new life, since he is highly aware of the background that caused her present status. He may have also known an aspect of Julie that she has concealed from herself in her previous life. Towards the end of the film, he suggests to Julie that they should name themselves as the composers of the concerto for the unification of Europe. Julie has never admitted that she takes part in Patrice’s composition. Now Julie finally takes a step in identifying herself as a musical collaborator. Olivier must have known how essential music is in Julie’s life. He actually proposes to complete Patrice’s composition, so that he might help Julie to recover her passion for music and life. When Julie asks him about the project, he clarifies the reason why he had accepted the work: “So I could make you cry, so I could make you run. It was the only way to make you care.” Julie loses her words for a moment; she is losing her dominance over him. Insdorf finds a duality in Olivier’s character. According to her, he is finishing Patrice’s composition “like a dutiful shadow.” However, he regards himself as “a composer in his own right.” He had previously asked Julie for her advice on his draft of the score. However, at the end, when Julie tells him on the phone that she has finished the composition, he refuses to accept her version of the score, saying that his attempt means that it is his own work, no matter how incomplete it might be. There is a scene where the screen shows him with his reflection on the lid of a grand piano, and Insdorf suggests that the image means an “externalisation of his split personality.”

At the end of the film, Julie makes love with Olivier. David Bromwich interprets this as “a consolation she can give rather than take” for his less than outstanding music talent. It is true that Julie is “very generous” in some ways as is described in the film by her treatment of Patrice’s mistress and through her assistance in Patrice’s composition without announcing her contribution to the work. However, even though she appears extraordinary generous at times from a common sense perspective, she also seems to have her own reasons for that generosity. Maybe she gave her husband’s inheritance to his mistress, because she could not bear the thought of self-abhorrence.
born of jealousy. She may have rather preferred that the woman would be indebted to her. In the last scene when she makes love with Olivier, she finally seems to accept Olivier’s love rather than “consoling” him. This relationship between Olivier and Julie is contrastive to that in the beginning of the film where Julie takes the initiative and controls the whole situation: she calls him to her place when she wants, and leaves him behind abruptly without explanations. Now she goes to his place herself and accepts his love. When they make love this time, she finally cries. Insdorf interprets the tears as suggestive of “a return to life.” Although her past life with a successful composer may have appeared almost perfect, it must have been lacking in something fundamental, considering that her husband had had a mistress for years in secret. Now she has overcome the shock of the accident and the discovery of the mistress. She has also found love in music as well as in Olivier and, with his support, she is now able to admit that she takes part in composing music, which she could never do before. Through the disastrous experience in her life, Julie might have become happier at the end of the film with a transformed self.

2.2 White

Karol Karol, named after Charles Chaplin, is a young Polish hairdresser living in France. At the beginning of the film, he is forced to divorce his beautiful French wife owing to impotence. At first, he is devastated, then he decides to seek revenge on his ex-wife, Dominique, by becoming her equal. He returns to Poland with the help of Mikolaj whom he encounters at the train station, while playing a Polish song on a comb wrapped in a paper. Karol manages to accumulate a fortune in his own country and, subsequently, prepares an intriguing plan for his revenge. He writes a will leaving all his fortune to his ex-wife, Dominique, and organises a fake funeral in order to lure her to Poland through the lucrative will. After his own funeral, Karol goes to Dominique’s hotel, and waits for her in bed. On her return, he reveals his plan and, recovering his sexual potency, they make love. The next morning, Karol leaves while Dominique is still asleep, and the police arrest Dominique on suspicion of killing her ex-husband for his wealth. Karol’s plan is not yet finished. Ironically, Dominique is now in the vulnerable position, just like Karol had been in France, for she is imprisoned for committing a murder of a man who is still alive. According to Karol’s original plan, he was to fly abroad before her arrest. However, he finds himself still in love with her and
decides to stay in Poland, visiting her in prison. The film ends when Dominique gestures her wish to remarry him from behind bars.

Kieslowski says, "White is about equality understood as a contradiction. . . . I don’t think anybody really wants to be equal. Everyone wants to be more equal." As Kieslowski puts it, after the main character goes through an extreme humiliation, is rejected in love, and loses his possessions, "he wants to show that not just is he not as low as he’s fallen, not just is he on a level with everybody else, but that he’s higher, that he’s better." In fact, once he arrives in his home country, he is not satisfied with only being a hairdresser, as he used to be. Soon after he begins his life in Poland again, he goes to see a Mafia-like man and tells him that being a hairdresser does not bring him much money and that making money is what he wants to learn about. Thus begins his new business where he becomes the boss and earns an outstanding amount of money. However, he also wants to be "more equal" in sexual ability than other men. When he finally succeeds in provoking Dominique’s orgasm, he says to her with satisfaction, “You were louder than you were on the phone.” The comment refers to Karol’s humiliation through Dominique’s behaviour with another man, relayed to Karol via the phone just before he leaves France.

There are different kinds of doubleness in this film. Firstly, the main character, Karol shows an amazing transformation from his sense of identity at the beginning of the film to a form of self-development brought about by his struggle to overcome a disastrous event in his life. A timid, pathetic man, who had nothing else except his hairdressing competency, transforms into a confident, commanding parvenu through a passionate drive for revenge. I would like to examine how he changes and how this change in him is presented in the film, arguing that the two Karols create a form of double over time. Also, his life gains a duality from the moment of his fake funeral, when he lives side by side with his deceased identity. The third doubleness is presented in the form of a white bust of a young lady. He finds the sculpture just before he leaves France and it becomes a symbol of his ex-wife as well as her substitute.

The changing circumstances of Karol’s life begin when he is confronted by impotence. Karol appears devastated and desperate, but he seems to overcome the miserable state as a defeated man when he is utterly humiliated by Dominique. He rings her at night from a train station, which is located in front of her apartment, while noticing a man’s shadow at her window. When she answers the phone, she forces him to listen to her orgasm with the man who is not, like Karol, impotent. He slams the phone
down, finding the machine has taken his change of two francs. He goes to the station clerk's window and tells a clerk that the machine has taken his change. The clerk almost ignores him at first, but then Karol, who had looked until then like a shy, cowardly man, tells him with an enraged face and voice that he had better give him the change. The matter of the change itself is a trifling incident. However, for Karol it is essentially a matter of fair trade and equality. At this moment, it seems that Karol decides to concentrate all his efforts on achieving a status of equality with his ex-wife. This coin, eventually conceded by the clerk, is his last coin and he takes it to Poland with him.

He again becomes mad about the coin, back in Poland. He is smuggled into his homeland in a suitcase that is stolen by airport workers and dropped off at a dump on top of a snowy hill. The robbers are furious to find that all their efforts to carry the enormously heavy suitcase end up with only a human body and a two francs coin. When one of them takes the coin away from him, Karol suddenly gains a surprising burst of energy. He attacks the man and retrieves his coin but, at the same time, he is kicked and hit by the men and thrown into a hole at the dump. Waking up, he looks at snow-covered Warsaw and says, "Home at last." He goes to his brother's hair salon where he convalesces. Karol, at one point, thinks of throwing the coin into a river. However, when he attempts to throw it away, he finds that the coin has stuck on his hand. He looks at the coin from below, holding his hand out with the palm down. He even shakes his hand a little to see if it will budge. It doesn't. The next camera shot shows a decisive face focused on a plan. He appears to be saying that he will not give up until he reaches his goal, no matter what happens. Then there is the first flash-forward of Dominique after his funeral. She is in black, looking down, in a very dark space, which turns out to be the hotel room in which she stays in Poland, when she comes over for her ex-husband's funeral.

This coin seems to symbolise Karol as a revenger. He receives the coin at the moment when he decides on his scheme of revenge on Dominique and he guards it up until the moment when he thinks his plan for revenge is totally organised by obtaining a dead body for his fake funeral. He and his assistant go to a train station at night where he buys an imported body whose face is smashed in and, thus, is unrecognisable. The body along with the precious coin is kept in a coffin. He is confident that Dominique will come to Poland for his funeral because of the will. Now he only waits to see her fall into his intriguing trap. Previously there is a scene where he spins the coin on a table and stares at it, followed by a flash-forward of the scene when Dominique comes back
to a hotel room after attending his funeral. His glaring face suggests his strong will to achieve his purpose.

Parting from his precious two franc coin, he now faces another phase of his life. He had organised a death certificate through his assistant and his fake funeral proceeds. At the funeral, he peeps at Dominique through binoculars. What he sees are her tears. His close-up shows his pity for her grief over his unreal death. The grief does not stay long because, after Karol astonishes Dominique in the hotel, they finally achieve consummation. However, the next morning, he leaves her in the room and hides himself. Finding herself alone in the room, Dominique rings Mikolaj in her quest to find her lover. The next conversation works on a dual level because of different perceptions about his existence:

Dominique: Where's Karol?
Mikolaj: He's dead.
Dominique: He's not, last night...
Mikolaj: You were at his funeral.
Dominique: I wasn't. He was alive.
Mikolaj: I'm sorry.
Dominique: You must help me find him... I love him.
Mikolaj: Sure. He's in Section 23, plot number 10,675. The name of the cemetery in Polish is Powazkowski.

She is trapped in the doubleness of his official death and his private actuality. Mikolaj's response is totally ironical, since he is one of a few people who know the truth behind the funeral. He stays thoroughly official for the fraternity of Karol, who once saved his life. While on the phone, Dominique hears a knock at the door. She cries with a joy, “He's back.” She opens the door only to find interrogating policemen whose presence had been planned by Karol in advance. In front of all these official people, her words about Karol being alive sound idiotic or even a vain, naive attempt to cover her guilt over his murder. She is literally caged in by his trap.

However, at the same time, Karol is trapped in his own scheme. Especially at the funeral and also through the loving night with Dominique, he seems to realise that he still loves her. That is why he does not take the plane as he had organised earlier to leave his past with Dominique behind. For him, the achievement of equality that seemed to be the very end of the story with Dominique now proves to be only another beginning. Instead of leaving all his former life in France and Poland for Singapore, he
goes in stealth to the prison where Dominique is incarcerated. Before visiting her at the prison, he stands for a while at the window at his brother's place in a daze, probably from the gap between his picture of the future and his actual situation at the culmination of his revenge. His brother warns him, "Don't stand in the window. Somebody will see you again." At this stage, Karol, who probably has impressed many of the audience with his elaborate scheme of revenge, appears diminished as if acknowledging that he has made so much effort only to place himself in bigger trouble. However, although originally outside of his plan, the grand scheme does bring about a happy realisation that he and Dominique still love each other. At the end of the film, Dominique promises to remarry him through gestures perceived between the prison bars, leaving Karol smiling through his tears. Later, at the end of Red, we see a glimpse of the two of them being rescued from a devastating ferry accident: they had departed for a voyage for their new life with love, which is now rescued again. Even though Karol has gone through a dramatic change in his life, his love for Dominique remains the same or even has grown more.

This conclusion seems to suggest that there are situations that can be intentionally changed, while less material aspects such as love are enduring. Here, the film, White resembles the preceding film, Blue. Both of the protagonists, Karol and Julie, consciously change their life, and partly their personality, in order to terminate their past lives. Their intentions succeed to a certain degree, but both confront elements that had not been part of their original plans. After all, life is controllable only to some extent, partly because we do not know enough about ourselves. In this case, probably both Karol and Julie underestimated their love, the love for Dominique in Karol's case and the love for music and perhaps for Olivier, in Julie's case.

Like Julie, Karol scarcely brings anything, in the material sense, from his previous life into the new one. The difference is that while Julie does so on purpose, Karol is forced to lose most of his possessions, including his hair salon and bank account. He only intentionally gets rid of his certificates from his hairdressing career, which had represented the centre of his life up until then. He had met Dominique at a hairstyle competition and, subsequently, they married and opened a fashionable hair salon in Paris. Insdorf points out a similarity between the scene where Karol throws away his rolled up diplomas onto the tracks in a subway before leaving France, and the scene in Blue where Julie throws Patrice's score of Concerto into a rubbish truck, both of which represent their attempt to "free themselves from the immediate past."86 Geoff Andrew
acknowledges the same point, saying that both Blue and White have common themes, one of which is "the need to let go of the past, while at the same time acknowledging its existence, in order to proceed with the present."87 On the other hand, there are some things that both Karol and Julie take with them into their new life. For Julie it is her daughter’s blue chandelier, which she takes with her, when she moves into her new apartment. Karol insists on taking two things with him to his homeland. One is the two franc coin, mentioned earlier, and the other is a white bust of a young lady. This bust plays an important role in his new life as a symbol of Dominique and is associated with the meaning of the chandelier for Julie, being a symbolic reminder of her daughter and her past life.

Karol finds the bust in a shop window in France. When he decides to go back to Poland with Mikolaj’s help, he tells him that he has to do something first. It is to steal the bust from the shop. The bust gets broken when one of the thieves throws it away. The thieves also throw Karol into the dump, and when he wakes, he finds the bottom part of the bust and grabs it. When he is settled in his brother’s place in Poland, he fixes the bust. While sticking the last broken piece into its proper place, the bust moves a little. In reality, it is just because his hand happened to push the object lightly. However, it looks as if the bust has gained a life of its own, particularly to Karol, who still desires his ex-wife. He gives an affectionate look to the bust, and pushes it again. On another night, he is learning French from a cassette tape and he turns his attention towards the bust, moving closer and closer to it. The bust’s head is inclined to one side slightly. For a moment, it looks as if two lovers are looking at each other in the dark. The white bust now looks black because of the darkness and Karol kisses the still form. Here the bust plays the role of the substitute for his ex-wife. Unlike Dominique, the girl of the bust does not reject him. She just looks at him warmly.

One night, Karol calls Dominique’s name in his dream. The camera shows a close-up of the statue located on top of a tall set of drawers before approaching Karol blurred in the background. We hear him call her name, while looking at the image of the bust, so it feels as if the bust has gained the substance of the name. The camera shifts its focus on Karol, as he wakes up. When he wakes up, he rings Dominique, but as soon as she realises who is calling, she rejects him and hangs up the phone. While the real Dominique is present, the bust is out of the screen. Karol disappointedly puts down the phone and gives a reproachful look in the direction of the bust. The next shot shows the bust looking down at him as ever.
The bust has a strong presence in Karol’s life, the camera quite often capturing Karol with the bust, whether or not there is any interaction between the two of them. The sculpture actually seems to change its position depending on where Karol is. For instance, when he is getting dressed in his room to make an arrangement about the land with Mafia-like men, the camera captures the bust at the background by the window in the gentle morning sunshine. The bust’s changing locations suggest that Karol must have needed something to fill the absence of Dominique in his life.

The reference to doubleness through reflection is present in this film, too, as in *The Double Life of Veronique* and in *Blue*. When Karol visits a farmhouse that he intends to purchase, he stays overnight. When he wakes up in the morning, he looks at his reflection in a glass, using the reflection to arrange his hair. His image is slightly deformed because of the uneven surface of the glass. For a brief moment, he looks slimmer and tougher, and to some degree, he has actually become like that. He is at the farm from which he will make a huge profit and, although he still has to deal with the gang from whom he stole the information about the land, he is not scared of anything anymore, probably because he has gone through the worst. He creates a new hairstyle for himself in the mirror image, combing back all his hair into a style that projects his businessman image. He changes his clothes, too. He wears a fashionable business suit, and his behaviour reflects his confidence about what he is doing. He does not look like the guy any more who was playing songs with his comb for some coins down at the train station. However, he has not completely changed. Rather we see the two faces of Karol now, the business face of Karol and the face of Karol in love. When he is dealing with his business, he is confident and knows what to do, everything working as he wishes. On the contrary, his face is totally vulnerable in dealing with his emotions, as, for instance, when he rings Dominique.

Mikolaj offers another type of doubleness through talking about himself in the third person singular in order to make it sound like a story about someone else. This trait first appears when he meets Karol for the first time. When Karol tells him about his difficult situation, Mikolaj offers him a job. In response to questions about the details of the work, Mikolaj explains: “It’s to kill someone. It’s what he wants himself. He says he’s lost the will to live. A compatriot. He’ll pay very well, enough to live on for six months.” At this stage, Karol refuses to be involved in such a job as he is not yet ready to do anything in pursuit of his goal. However, later in Poland, Karol asks about the job again. At this stage, Karol does not seem to have any suspicion that Mikolaj actually
refers to Mikolaj himself. He asks Mikolaj if he is still in touch with “the man.” When Mikolaj replies that he can make contact with him, Karol says; “He needs help. Someone has to help him.” This is how Karol justifies pursuing such a job, although he is talking about himself, too, since it is Karol who desperately needs help now, help from Mikolaj.

Karol and Mikolaj arrange the time and date for the job to be done. When Karol arrives in the dark subway, Mikolaj appears. Karol asks him, “What happened? Did he change his mind?” At this stage, Mikolaj finally confesses that the story is his own. He urges the hesitating Karol to shoot him by grabbing Karol’s gun and targeting himself on his chest. Karol shoots. When Mikolaj begins falling down with the sound of the gunshot, the screen shows the movement in slow motion for the first and last time in the film. Karol supports him quickly before he collapses. Slowly, Mikolaj opens his eyes. Karol must have anticipated that Mikolaj was talking about himself, since he had prepared an empty shell in the gun’s firing compartment. He tells Mikolaj that the second shot will be real, if that is what he wishes. Karol repeats his question, “Are you sure?” Mikolaj finally shakes his head in denial. Mikolaj insists that Karol should still take the money for his work. Karol accepts but only as a loan for his new business, which they establish together later on.

The next scene takes place on a frozen lake. The white colour dominates the screen, contrasting with the previous shadowy scene in the subway. Now filled with life, they run and slip on the ice like two children. Mikolaj says that he feels as if he had just finished school. Mikolaj says, “Anything’s possible,” and gives a loud cry of joy. Karol seems to have not only saved him, but also raised him onto the next phase in his life, wherein Mikolaj gains a real appreciation of life in contrast to his previous existence like a dead man. For the first time in the film, Mikolaj laughs with joy in response to his new, second life. Similarly, the concept of death gives Karol another life. As we have seen earlier, his scheme of a fake funeral brings his ex-wife back and leads to the realisation of his love for her. Insdorf mentions the same point, saying that both Karol and Mikolaj go through a deceptive death to be reborn with a second chance which she regards as a theme that penetrates the Three Colours trilogy: earlier mistakes serve as a foundation for future successes.89
2.3 Red

*Red*, the last film of the trilogy, takes place in Geneva and the story is about a friendship between a young model and student, Valentine, and an old retired judge, Joseph Kern. Kieslowski also says that it is a film of isolation. The location of the film was deliberately chosen, for he considers Switzerland as the most isolated among all European countries. The main characters, Valentine and Joseph are both isolated in their own way. Besides, the frequent appearance of phone conversations seems to draw attention to the isolation born of modern life in general. Valentine is a good-natured, gentle girl. She has a boyfriend, but he is abroad on business, and their only communication is through phone calls. From their phone talk, it becomes apparent that her boyfriend holds a strong sense of possession over her, with no room for trust. He repeatedly asks if she is by herself and what she has been doing, as if to control her life even from overseas. At one time, he suggests that she discontinue her job as a model. Valentine rejects his suggestion in a mild manner. On the other hand, when Valentine asks him if he loves her, he only replies that he thinks so. While Valentine wants a clearer reply, he says that there is no difference between whether he loves her, or he thinks he does. At the same time, Valentine is anxious about her sixteen-year-old brother named Marc. He has been addicted to drugs, since discovering that his father was not his real father at the age of fifteen. Valentine, living apart from both her brother and mother, worries about them both. She suggests that her brother visit their mother because she would enjoy his company. At the same time, she warns him not to mention anything about his drug problem. Valentine cannot endure the thought of her mother learning to know about her son’s unhappy condition. In the end, she decides to leave for England to see her boyfriend, although she is still worried about the situation.

Joseph, on the other hand, has had an early retirement from his judicial profession. He is living by himself on top of a hill in Geneva. He is deeply hurt from an experience of deception caused by a girlfriend in his youth, and ever since, he has not had close relations with women. Now he spends his time eavesdropping on his neighbour’s phone conversations. In this way, he has insight into other people’s private feelings, while refusing to have any real relationships himself. However, Valentine brings about a change in his pessimistic views of life. One day, Valentine runs over his dog, Rita. Finding a label on her neck with the address, she immediately takes the dog to the owner, Joseph. However, his attitude is far from what she had expected. He tells her that
he does not really care about the dog. In shock and rage, Valentine takes the dog to a veterinary doctor. There she finds that Rita’s injury is not very serious and that she is expecting puppies. Consequently, she decides to keep the dog at her place. One day, she takes Rita for a walk, only to find that when Valentine releases the leash that the dog disappears. Valentine returns to Joseph’s place, where she finds the dog reinstalled with her owner. In a way, the dog brings the two characters together. On this second visit to his place, Valentine happens to find him eavesdropping on his neighbour’s phone conversation. Although she feels his behaviour is offensive, there is not much she can do about it. Furthermore, she is shocked by his negative view of people.

However, her visit leads the old judge to stop his eavesdropping. Soon after she leaves, he decides to write both to the court and to his neighbours to denounce himself. Consequently, his story appears in the paper, which prompts another visit from Valentine in order to let him know that she has not talked about him to anyone. Valentine’s reaction is exactly in accord with what Joseph expected. He reveals that his real motivation in denouncing himself was to see her again. This third meeting between them is much more amiable than the previous two. Both protagonists seem to have broken down their psychological barriers and they freely talk about themselves. As a result, Valentine invites him to her fashion show and, thus, Joseph begins to assume significance in her life, just as she does in his life.

The film has a sub plot revolving around a young man named Auguste who lives near Valentine. Their lives often cross, but they never appear to notice each other until the end of the film. Auguste seems to repeat Joseph’s life in fine detail. Firstly, he passes an examination to become a judge in exactly the same way as Joseph had done many years earlier. They both happen to drop their law book before the day of their examination and read the page opened by the incident. The answers to the examination questions are on that page, which contributes greatly for them to gain their legal qualifications. Secondly, both men are deceived by their partners. Joseph knows Auguste through his phone eavesdropping and from seeing him with his girlfriend who lives across the road, a spatial relationship replicated by August and Valentine. As the story evolves, the connection between Joseph and Auguste is revealed. The film ends when Auguste finally meets Valentine in a ferry accident.

The film, Red, also incorporates alternative kinds of doubleness than those that occur in the other films that we have examined. The major doubled relationship can be found in the connection between the retired judge and the young judge, further
consolidated by the similarity between Joseph's lover and Auguste's girlfriend both in their deceptive behaviours and appearances. The old judge is, at the same time, often considered a double figure of the director, Kieslowski himself. I will address this relationship in Chapter Three. Valentine gains a kind of double in Joseph's dream, where she appears as an older woman, intimating that the dream figure glimpses into Valentine's future. Valentine's presence is often dominated by photographic images, which is similar to the existential power of photos in The Double Life of Veronique. There is also a powerful use of reflections throughout the film. Details of these points will be examined in the following section.

The first scene shows someone's hand dialling a phone alongside Valentine's framed photo. The person who is making a call turns out to be her boyfriend, Michel. Many of her photos are inserted during the film, for she is a fashion model, currently making a chewing gum commercial. There is a scene of a cameraman shooting her in a studio, where Valentine stands in front of a bright red background. Amongst the many photos taken, Valentine chooses the one with a sad look on her face to be enlarged for the advertisement. This huge poster exerts a great presence throughout the film. It is hung on the wall of a busy street in Geneva and the film shows both Auguste and Joseph respectively seeing the image for the first time. When Auguste finds it, he even stops for a while at the cross section until the following car beeps at him. This incident contrasts with the fact that he never notices the real Valentine crossing so closely next to him every now and then in the town. Joseph also spends some time watching the picture of Valentine.

We see the huge image of Valentine getting crashed on the ground, when the poster is taken away owing to a storm towards the end of the film. This collapsed image may be meant to be an omen because shortly after this occurrence, she is involved in a disastrous ferry accident on her way to see her boyfriend. Fortunately, she is found among the seven survivors out of some 1,400 people on the ferry. At the end of the film, we see Valentine on the television news that captured the rescuing scene. The film ends with a close-up of Valentine's face just after the rescue, which closely resembles the picture of her on the poster. The poster image, captured when the cameraman tells her to think of something disastrous in order to achieve a look of great sadness, is replicated in the television frame in the aftermath of a genuine tragedy. Although she is lucky enough to survive the disaster, as Geoff Andrew points out, we should not forget that the experience took away more than 1,400 lives.
lnsdorf cites Kieslowski's comment on fate with regard to the connection between the photo and the last image of the film: "Fate was pre-ordained: the image of her existed before the catastrophe. Maybe there is fate, an image that has to repeat itself."92

lnsdorf points out in detail that the last image of Valentine is the left profile in the same manner as the previously taken photo for the advertisement, and the gray sweater around her shoulder in the photo "foreshadows" the same coloured blanket wrapped around her in the scene of the rescue. Insdorf also notes a similar relation between a picture image and the real in other parts of the film. She refers to a painting of a ballerina in Auguste’s room, observing that Valentine incarnates this image of female beauty when she arches her back in the same manner during her ballet lesson later in the film, a scene cited earlier in comparison with the life of Weronika.93

The ferry accident finally brings Auguste and Valentine together. On the television screen that Joseph is watching, we see these two characters being rescued together. It is suggested through Auguste and Valentine's unspoken exchange that their relationship has the potential to develop. Among the other survivors are Julie and Olivier from Blue, and Karol and Dominique from White, and one other, a bar man, whom we do not know. We finally see that all the major characters in the trilogy have been rescued. Some people may think that this resolution is too much of a coincidence, being too artificial that one ferry accident contained all the major characters from the three films as survivors. However, Kieslowski formed the idea from the opposite direction, wishing to make a series about survivors of an accident, just as he had decided to tell stories about residents in the same apartment complex in Warsaw for his Decalogue series. He says that everyone has a story that is worth looking into.94

In terms of the use of reflections in Red, Joseph’s mysterious house offers a great scope. When Veronique visits Joseph’s place for the second time, the camera captures her with two mirror images in the background. The camera also shows a clear life size image of her face on the glass of a picture frame, while Joseph talks to her about the relationship between Auguste and his lover. A strong effect is achieved by the strength conveyed in the reflected image against the more vulnerable expression on her actual face. The two disparate images are captured in the same camera frame next to each other, as if to portray the dual sides of her inner life.

Joseph’s house, as a place to generate these reflections, may imply that Joseph himself has spent so long in reflecting his life and his potential lives. Auguste could be a mere product of Joseph imagining what his life would be like if he had been born
decades later. Kieslowski himself says: "we'll never be sure whether Auguste really
does exist or whether he is only a variation of the judge's life forty years later."95 The
next conversation between Valentine and Joseph may support this argument, for it
suggests that, as a judge, Joseph has spent his life considering the lives of the accused
from their viewpoints, using his imagination to interpret human behaviour in a
multitude of different situations. The conversation is triggered by an incident of a stone
thrown against his window. He has just denounced himself and he confesses that it is the
sixth time that someone has thrown a stone at his house. While Valentine cleans up the
broken window, he stays calmly on his chair, and then goes to the window. She inquires
if he is not afraid. He replies, "I wonder what I'd done if I were them. I'd do the same."
Valentine does not hide her surprise; "Throw stones?" He admits without hesitation, "If
I were them? Of course. And that applies to everyone I've tried. In their situation, I'd
steal, too. I'd kill, I'd lie... Of course I would. I didn't because I wasn't in their shoes."
Joseph, in contrast to his first impression as an unpleasant, even cold-hearted man,
appears to be a very compassionate person. He would have thought about what he
would have done in his own life, if the situation were different. For instance, he may
have imagined a happy marriage, if his first and last love had not died so young from an
accident. Or he may have wondered about his life, if he had not passed the exam to
become a judge. He may have become a judge only from the coincidence of dropping
the law book, which opened at the page that gave the answers to the exam questions.

The doubled relationship between Joseph and Auguste is different from that of
Weronika and Veronique. Firstly, their connection is not based on identical appearance.
The doubling emerges because of the two men's similar life course and the coincidental
things that occur in their lives. Another difference is that, as Kieslowski explains,
Veronique and Weronika both have an intuition about the other's existence, while in
Red, Auguste has no idea about Joseph, though Joseph knows about him. The director
says that the film is about a question posed as to whether people are sometimes born in
the wrong time by coincidence. It is strongly suggested in the film and by the director
that Joseph and Valentine would make a good couple, if only they had been born in the
same generation. Therefore, as Kieslowski admits, he uses the conditional mood for the
story. That is, he explores the case of Joseph being born forty years later in the form of
Auguste.96

In relation to the question of Auguste's existence, Insdorf cites her interview with
the director at the 1994 Cannes Film Festival: "The theme of 'Red' is in the conditional
mood...what would have happened if the judge had been born forty years later.... It would be lovely if we could go back to the age of twenty. How many better, wiser things we could have done! But it’s impossible. That’s why I made this film - that maybe life can be lived better than we do.”97 However, he also poses a question of whether the judge really exists. He notes that the tribunal is the only place that the audience see him with other people. He says that otherwise, “he could be merely a ghost, or better yet, a possibility - the old age that awaits Auguste, what might have happened if Auguste had not taken the ferry,” that is, if he had not met Valentine.98 After all, the answer for the question of whether Auguste is an echo of Joseph or if Joseph represents one of the possibilities in Auguste’s life seems to depend merely on the perspective of the viewer, and the fact that Kieslowski gives two different ideas seems to suggest that it would not matter either way.

Joseph and Auguste’s main problem lies in their relationship with their respective girlfriends. Auguste has a blonde, attractive girlfriend, who is a year or two older than him. It is revealed later that Joseph had an older blonde girlfriend, too. Asked about his lover by Valentine after her fashion show, Joseph describes her as follows: “A student, two years ahead of me. She was blonde, delicate...luminous... She had a long neck. Her clothes were pale. Her furniture was pale.” Auguste’s girlfriend congratulates him when he passes his exam to become a judge and gives him a pen as a present. It is implied that Joseph also received a pen from his girlfriend. When he decides to write letters to denounce himself, he finds that his pen is broken after many years of use. Not long after Auguste passes the exam, he finds out that his lover is deceiving him. One night, after being unable to contact her by phone for a whole day, he drives to her apartment, eavesdrops at her door, and hears something, probably a man’s voice. He climbs up to her window, which is two or three storey high and sees a man moving between his naked girlfriend’s legs. The experience is basically the same as that which Joseph confronted decades earlier, though in this instance the image was caught in a mirror. The audience become aware of the repeated incident when Joseph confesses to Valentine about the day that he saw his girlfriend’s white legs spread out with a man between them in her mirror with the white frame.

There are a couple of additional things that are common to both of them. One commonality is that they both live with a dark coloured dog. Secondly, just as Weronika and Veronique both favour Budenmajer’s music, Joseph and Auguste also like his music. Another coincidence concerns a failure of their car batteries. On the night that
August finds out about his girlfriend’s adultery, he leaves his car lights on. Valentine notices that the battery is fading, as she looks out of her apartment window. Later, during her conversation with Joseph, he mentions that his car battery was low on the night before his examination to become a judge. The camera captures Valentine’s attention in response to the comment about his battery. She probably associates Joseph’s incident with her memory of Auguste’s car battery, which leads her to a clearer awareness of the doubled life of Joseph and Auguste.

Joseph seems to have been aware of Auguste as his double for quite a while, whereas Auguste is totally unaware of Joseph. Joseph even anticipates the end of Auguste’s relationship with his girlfriend, while it appears as if they are still happy together. From another angle, there is a question about Auguste’s existence. He may be a flashback of Joseph in a slightly deformed manner, or an incarnation of one of Kieslowski’s repeated questions of “what if...?”, as I mentioned earlier. What if Valentine were born some decades earlier? The apparently happy middle-aged woman in Joseph’s dream prompts Valentine to ask more about the dream next time she sees him: ‘In that dream... was there someone else?’ Her curiosity appears to relate to her feeling of insecurity about her boyfriend. Joseph’s dream does not identify the woman’s partner even though Valentine feels that he has gained a kind of a prophet’s power. The man who was lying beside her could be Joseph himself in retrospect, or it could be Auguste, for Valentine and Auguste seem to be fated to meet. The film catches many times when the two pass by and still do not notice each other. But when Auguste finally notices her, the look on his face is very serious. If Auguste was really an incarnation of Joseph’s dreamt life with a real lover, Joseph should be happy to see them together on television after the ferry accident. In fact, he gives a subtle smile when the camera focuses him at the end.

However, what would become of the relationship between Joseph and Valentine, once Valentine comes back to Geneva? Insdorf suggests that the developing relation between Valentine and Joseph might result in that of a father and daughter, making reference to the fact of Valentine’s father’s absence and Joseph’s isolated life without family.

It is doubtful that their relationship would grow in this direction, especially since Joseph regrets not having met Valentine in his youth. That is, he perceives her as an impossible but ideal lover, being highly aware of the age gap between them, which appears to be impossible to transcend. After all, the best he seems to be able to do is to watch his unaccomplished dream to be realised in his young self, Auguste.
Geoff Andrew uses the word “alter ego or younger self” to describe the August’s relationship to Joseph. Andrew is also one of the many critics who suggests Joseph’s role as “God.” He argues that Joseph has been playing “God” to some extent, because of his extraordinary knowledge about the intersections of the people’s lives around him through his eavesdropping habit. However, Andrew also restricts the extent of his God-like powers since Joseph is “neither omnipotent nor even omniscient.” He says that Joseph rather “seems to ‘direct’ people, as if they were characters in a script which he then tweaks and turns into a finished film.” In this sense, he sees Joseph as “some kind of self-portrait by Kieslowski.” This argument will be extended in the following chapter.

Again in reference to Joseph, there is not only the argument of his doubled relationship to Auguste, but also that of his rebirth through his encounter with Valentine. Andrew notes that Joseph is “reborn” through “learning to accept the mistakes and disappointments of his own past” by interacting with Valentine, and Andrew finds the proof of his “regeneration” in his increasing gestures of warmth. Insdorf not only finds rebirth in Joseph but also in Valentine and Auguste, within the context of her argument that one of the penetrating themes throughout the trilogy is the subject of second chance. She observes that the retired judge gains a second chance to be human through Valentine and that Valentine and the younger double of the judge, Auguste, obtain a second chance in the ferry crash to survive and “be ‘reborn’ together.”

Insdorf relates the theme of sexual betrayal as a connection across the trilogy. In Blue, Julie finds out that her past husband had a mistress, and in White, Karol discovers that his ex-wife has a partner. Julie and Karol overcome the hurtful experience, while Joseph seems not to have been able to transcend his past to begin a new life. Auguste seems to have the potential to establish a new life, when he finally meets Valentine through the ferry crash, after his painful experience of witnessing his girlfriend making love with another man. Perhaps it is Joseph’s regret about his life that motivates him to closely watch his double figure’s life. Maybe he is a little relieved in seeing his double lead a better life, and that is why he smiles at the end when Auguste finally encounters Valentine because she represents the woman who Joseph himself never met in his younger days.

Andrew comments on the shared theme across the trilogy as follows: “Each Three Colours film focuses on a solitary character or characters who are inherently ‘good’ but
who have somehow, due to a traumatic change in their lives, lost their way. . . . A crucial step, for each, is to learn from the errors and disappointments of the past, and then to set aside the past so that they may get on with living out the present.”\textsuperscript{107} This theme may also extend from Three Colours to The Double Life of Veronique, in which Veronique gains wisdom that her heart condition would be fatal if she continued singing through the mysterious connection with Weronika who died in the middle of her career. The recurring scene with an old person trying to put an empty bottle into a recycle bin in Three Colours offers another connection with The Double Life of Veronique. In the latter film, an old woman appears both in Poland and in France, as is mentioned in Chapter One. In Poland, Weronika sees a woman carrying bags and offers help, but ends up not helping her. In France, Veronique finds a woman walking away with a stick. In Red, the old person actually gains help in their trouble. After Weronika, Julie and Karol fail to help the person, Valentine simply goes towards the person and stretches her arm to put the bottle in the bin. This gesture seems to be fitting as the concluding work of the Three Colours, which unfortunately turns out to be Kieslowski’s last film. Referring to these scenes with an old person, Insdorf cites Kieslowski’s comment on his intention at the 1994 New York Film Festival: “All I want to say is, ‘You can help an old woman who is too old to get the bottle in.’ It’s just a reminder that someday, we too might be too old to push a bottle into a bin.”\textsuperscript{108} In this sense, the old woman can be seen as a double figure of each member of the audience in a conditional mood, by showing a glimpse of what we might become when aged. The connection extended across generations presented in Red seems to find its extension in the whole trilogy and in The Double Life of Veronique.
Chapter 3 Doubling Between the Creators and the Created

In this chapter, I would like to explore the relationship between the characters’ lives in Kieslowski’s films and the real lives of those who created the films such as the director and the musical director. Whether intentionally or otherwise, the fictional screen characters sometimes form double aspects of their creators’ lives. For instance, sometimes Kieslowski reveals which parts of his scripts are due to ideas drawn directly from his own experiences. On the other hand, there are cases where the creators’ real lives happen to repeat the lives of the characters in the films to some extent. There is also a case where a double figure of one of the creators has been playfully inserted in the films as in the case of Van der Budenmajer who is a fictitious double of the musical director, Zbigniew Preisner. This chapter is divided into two sections: the first section deals with Preisner, who contributed to a great extent in Kieslowski’s films, and his double, Van der Budenmajer, and the second section with Kieslowski and his doubles in his films.

3.1 Zbigniew Preisner and Van der Budenmajer

Zbigniew Preisner is the musical director of Kieslowski’s films in No End, Decalogue, The Double Life of Veronique and Three Colours. Kieslowski refers to Preisner as an exceptional composer, who does not just think of music as filling the gaps in a finished version of a film, but who works on a film from the beginning of the process to the end. Preisner finds a musical thread of potential meaning for scenes where the images and text do not of themselves achieve a complete connection. In these instances, something can begin to exist with an overlay of music. Kieslowski describes it as follows: “It’s interesting - drawing out something which doesn’t exist in the picture alone or in the music alone. Combining the two, a certain meaning, a certain value, something which also determines a certain atmosphere, suddenly begins to exist.” In case of Blue, Insdorf, pointing to the fact that Preisner composed the whole score before shooting began, regards the role of the music in the film as follows: “the music is . . . a ‘pre-text,’ its melodies, textures, and rhythms engendering action.”

One curious fact is that Preisner has a double in the Kieslowski’s films in which he works as a musical director. He and Kieslowski have created a composer called “Van der Budenmajer.” The character often appears in the films together with “his” music. He is invented as a Dutch composer who lived in the nineteenth century. He has dates of birth and death and his compositions have catalogue numbers for recordings.
of course composes them in practice, but he seems to like the idea of referring to them as works by this fictitious composer, Van der Budenmajer. He seems to have been particularly real to the editors of the Oxford Press. When they were preparing a new edition of their music encyclopaedia, they contacted Kieslowski to gain some information about this great classical composer. Kieslowski replied, noting that Van der Budenmajer was a fictional character and that his music is actually composed by a self-taught, contemporary composer, Zbigniew Preisner. However, the editors remained unconvinced, thinking that Kieslowski was trying to protect his sources. They asked him again, very politely. Kieslowski replied with the same answer. Apparently, they kept asking the same questions for about half a year, until Kieslowski stopped corresponding with them.\(^{112}\)

Let us look at how Van der Budenmajer appears in the films. In Decalogue 9, a secondary character, Ola, introduces her heart doctor, the male protagonist of the film, Roman, to Van der Budenmajer’s music. He buys a record of Budenmajer and, the next time that he sees her, he mentions that he heard the recording. The girl asks if he remembers any of the music. He sings a little and, then, the girl continues the song in her beautiful voice. In The Double Life of Veronique, Veronique mentions Van der Budenmajer in her primary school music class. She introduces one of the songs written by him to the class for her pupils to play in their small-scale orchestra. “I really like this piece.” She talks to the children about the song, which Weronika once sang and which is also used in Alexandre’s puppet show. “It’s a very interesting composer. He was discovered only recently although he lived in Holland over two centuries ago.” Over two centuries ago? This information does not really match the information given by Kieslowski that he lived at the end of 19th century, unless the film takes place after at the end of 21st century.\(^{113}\)

In Blue, the name of Van der Budenmajer is mentioned once, when Julie and Olivier are about to work on the finale of Patrice’s unfinished concerto. When Olivier shows Julie the work that he has done on Patrice’s composition, she realises that he has not grasped the motivating idea of the finale. She takes out Patrice’s notes, and tells Olivier, “He said to me ‘This is a tribute.’ See if you can incorporate it.” Olivier looks at the note, “Van der Budenmajer?” Julie replies, “Yes. He wanted to honour him at the end of the concert.” It is interesting when we think that Preisner is playing all the roles of the tributary (Patrice), he who is honoured (Van der Budenmajer), as well as the
successor (Olivier) and the musical adviser (Julie) of the work, which in actuality is all Preisner’s music. He has multiple faces in this film.

In *Red*, Joseph, Auguste, and Valentine all favour the music by Van der Budenmajer. Budenmajer first appears in a scene in Joseph’s house in the shape of portrait, when Valentine visits him for the second time. She goes to his place to see Rita, the dog, as well as to ask him if he has sent her money for the treatment of his dog. She had received an envelope containing some money earlier in the film. Apparently, the sender’s address was missing, but Valentine guesses that it was from Joseph. Informing him that the dog’s treatment did not cost as much as the amount sent, Joseph goes to get her some change. He does not return for some time, so she goes into the house and finds out about his spying on his neighbours. When she is about to leave, he picks up the change that he had put on a record near the speaker. The notes uncover an old portrait of Van der Budenmajer on the record cover. At this stage, the screen shows only the last part of his name.

The other piece of the puzzle is offered in a later scene, where the same portrait is seen on a CD jacket in a music shop. Valentine goes to the music shop and listens to one of the CD samples, which turn out to be the one by Van der Budenmajer. Next to her, Auguste and his girlfriend are listening to the same CD, though Valentine is unaware of the coincidence, for they are both using headphones. This may imply, along with the excessive use of phone calls, that there is a lack of communication in the highly technological society. When Valentine asks for the CD, trying to pronounce his name properly, the shop assistant shows her a CD case with a portrait of Budenmajer on the jacket in order to confirm her particular choice. Valentine nods only to discover that they have just sold the last copy to Auguste and his girlfriend. It is interesting that while she is in the music shop, we not only hear the Budenmajer’s CD through Valentine’s headphone, but also hear a fragment of the tango from *White*, which, naturally, is also composed by Preisner. Insdorf points out that the music that Valentine listens to in the shop is the same song that Ola in *Decalogue 9* sings for her doctor.\(^{114}\) Andrew notes that this song, which appears in both *Decalogue 9* and *Red*, is titled “Do Not Take Another Man’s Wife” on the soundtrack CD for *Red*.\(^{115}\) This title presents the problem of adultery common to both of the films.

Not only is the music in these films purportedly composed by Preisner’s double figure, Budenmajer, but also the music sometimes gains substance like a double to some of the characters in the films. Insdorf comments on the shared role of music in The
Double Life of Veronique, and the following film, Blue. She observes that the music serves as “a reminder of the heroine’s double - or other life” in both of the films: in the former as a representation of Weronika after her death, and in the latter as a reminder of Julie’s past self.\(^{116}\) In The Double Life of Veronique, although Weronika dies 27 minutes into the film, her singing often appears in the latter part of the film, which is about Veronique’s life. It suggests that Weronika interacts in her double’s life in the shape of music after her physical death. Just as the ballerina in Alexandre’s puppet show goes through a metamorphosis to become a butterfly, Weronika might be seen as having transformed into a metaphysical existence through her special connection with her double, Veronique, in order to warn her about the fatality about her singing career.

In Blue, a particular music recurs in Julie’s life, as we have seen in Chapter Two. It is part of her husband’s unfinished composition commissioned for the advent of European unity. Insdorf suggests that this recurring music has a presence like a ghost. She refers to the scene where Julie is struck for the first time by the appearance of the music. She observes that Julie “looks as if she has seen a ghost.”\(^{117}\) She also names the scene where Julie hears an old flautist playing the same melody as that of Patrice’s concerto. She points to a shadow passing twice over the close-up of Julie’s coffee cup and saucer, as she hears the music, as an effect that suggests the ghostly character of the music. I deliberately avoided to say that the flautist played Patrice’s concerto, although the melody he plays sounds the same as Patrice’s, for it seems unlikely that he knew about Patrice’s unpublished concerto. When Julie asks him about the origin of the music, he only says that he invents all sorts of things. Kieslowski refers to the melody in his 1994 French television interview as follows: “Music notes all exist, waiting for someone to order them. That two individuals in different places can think of the same music is an example of what unites people.”\(^{118}\) In addition to the doubleness provoked by the melody, Insdorf points out that Jacek Ostaszewski, the actor who plays the role of the old flutist is also the flautist in the orchestra which plays Preisner’s music for Blue.\(^{119}\) That is, he played the music both in the film and outside the film.

Julie loves music. Music is integral to her past life with her husband and, thus, the music must be associated with a deep sense of loss after his death. The recurring fragment of music is one of the reminders of her past life, and the hardest amongst all to reject. She can leave the house in which she lived with her husband and daughter; she can sell or throw away their possessions; she can distance herself from their graveyard; and she can discard Patrice’s music manuscripts. However, she cannot find any way of
stopping the music resounding in her mind because of its immateriality. The music symbolises her past life. The film continually suggests that Julie may be a co-writer, or even the real composer of the music attributed to Patrice. At least, she must have helped him to refine his composition, since we see her amending Olivier’s score towards the end of the film. She appears very confident about her music ability and is adept about writing a musical score. Taking this aspect into account, the music has more meaning than just a reminder of her love for her husband. Julie may see music as symbolic of herself in the past, the memory of which she struggles to negate. In the end, we see that she accepts herself. She returns to music and, as a consequence, she no longer suffers from the blackouts with musical fragments in her mind. She has overcome her own ghost.

Towards the end of the film, Julie accepts not only her love for music but also Olivier’s suggestion about naming the two of them as composers of the music that Patrice left unfinished. She objects to his idea at first, but finally admits to being a co-writer of the work. This is a major change in her attitude towards music. For some reason, she has remained silent about her collaboration in Patrice’s composition, even though people must have guessed about her contribution. For instance, when a television reporter tries to interview her about the question of whether she is a real composer of the music attributed to Patrice, she leaves the spot to avoid answering her. Just as Preisner prefers to hide himself as a real composer behind the name of Van der Budenmajer, Julie may be a female double of her husband as a composer, in which case, Julie is also a double of Preisner.

Preisner helps to bring characters in Kieslowski’s films together through his music and his double, Van der Budenmajer. In Decalogue 9, as we have seen earlier, his music serves as a beginning point in establishing an understanding between a young patient, Ola, and her heart doctor, Roman. When the doctor listens to Ola’s favourite music through a recording as well as actually hearing her sing, he comprehends why she should undertake a heart operation to become a singer. In The Double Life of Veronique, Budenmajer’s music reinforces the relationship between Weronika and Veronique. Insdorf describes its role as follows: “Preisner’s melodies continue like magical aural strings between the two women, invoking invisible forces at work.”120 The music not only interweaves the lives of the two women together, but also draws Alexandre into the relationship. Initially, he is the one who introduces Weronika’s singing of Budenmajer’s music to Veronique, and the song recurs throughout the
interaction between Veronique and Alexandre. In **Blue**, Julie finally accepts to collaborate with Olivier to finish the composition due to Patrice’s memorandum about Budenmajer. In **Red**, his music is shared in between all the three major characters, Joseph, Valentine, and Auguste. Moreover, Budenmajer plays a role as a mediator who provides a connecting bridge between characters not only in each of the films, but also, as John Ottenhoff points out, across all of the four films of *The Double Life of Veronique* and *Three Colours*.¹²¹

### 3.2 Kieslowski and His Doubles

Here I would like to examine how Kieslowski’s real life is connected to his works. Some characters in his films can be considered as his double figure such as the retired judge in **Red** and the puppeteer in *The Double Life of Veronique*. However, there are many other aspects that reflect himself in his films. Kieslowski himself rarely reveals which part of the story is from his real life nor which character’s opinion reflects his own. However, it is possible to make a map about the connection between the director’s life and his art with the help of numerous fragments of information derived from him or from his works. *Kieslowski on Kieslowski* makes one of the most significant sources for this kind of search. It is his autobiographical writing edited by Danunsia Stok and reveals many episodes behind the screen as well as information about his background. It is written in English and, according to Tadeusz Sobolewski, Kieslowski agreed the book to be published with the restriction that they would publish it only after his death in Poland, which might indicate how hesitant he was to reveal the relationship between his life and his films in general.¹²²

Joseph in **Red** is probably most commonly considered as Kieslowski’s double among all the characters in his films. Insdorf is one of the many critics who regard Joseph as Kieslowski’s double.¹²³ Kieslowski himself admits that the judge reflects his own worldview greatly and that that is the reason why he says that the film **Red** is close to him.¹²⁴ Stuart Klawans names the judge as Kieslowski’s “screen double,” finding connection between them in their use of highly advanced electronic equipment “to track the intersections of people’s lives.”¹²⁵ Insdorf cites Piesiewicz’s comment at the 1997 Paris Colloquium to support the relationship of Kieslowski with his screen creation: “we feared him, in the best sense of the term. He was a judge, a good judge, a good frame of reference.”¹²⁶ Joseph seems to be seen as Kieslowski’s double partly because
of his director-like character who observes people’s lives and has a power to control them to some extent with his semi-omniscience.

The directorial attributes are also shared with the puppeteer, Alexandre, in The Double Life of Veronique. Ragland and Wright mention Alexandre as a seemingly “self-referential image of the film director.” Coates regards him as “a mise-en-abîme image of the director himself.” Insdorf is another critic who finds a connection between this storyteller and the director of the film. She observes that not only is Alexandre’s new work within the film about doubling, but also that “the doubling extends to that of Alexandre and the filmmaker.” She analyses the grounds of their relationship. Firstly, when the puppeteer is first seen in the film, he is surrounded by lighting equipment which is associated with the normal environment of a film director. The second point is that Alexandre presents the story through images of transformation.

Here Insdorf cites an interesting unpublished manuscript by a student: “Kieslowski’s recurring emphasis on doubling, through both fate and art, is an allegorical reflection of the film medium. In film, lives are artificially doubled on celluloid; the lives the audience witnesses are ghosts, the chemical indices of what has passed before the camera.” Different from the theatrical counterpart, the film actors who are presented in front of the audience are no longer in the space in the film world. Garbowski discusses the issue of the protagonists’ bodies in films in relation to the reflected images. He considers that the body image on the screen and the mirror image are similar in the way that they are “both simultaneously real and immaterial.” However, the difference is that “while the body which the reflection signifies is present at the time the image is visible, the cinematic body is a replica of what is no longer there.”

Insdorf also names Alexandre as an “omniscient manipulator,” referring to the scene where he points out Veronique’s holding a cigarette in the wrong way. The word “omniscient” applies to him particularly well in some parts. For instance, how could he have access to a recording of Weronika’s singing? It could not have been on the radio or television, for the main performer of the concert, Weronika, had died during the performance, unless the music was pre-recorded. Besides, how did he obtain not only Veronique’s address and phone number, but also that of her father? At the same time, he does not seem to be omniscient in all respects, since he does not know about Weronika...
and Veronique’s intuitive relationship nor the parallels that exist in their past lives. He has to listen to Veronique in order to obtain this information.

Another point that Insdorf makes with respect to the connection between the puppeteer and the director is that “perhaps like Kieslowski, Alexandre’s love for Veronique coexists with his exploitation of her.”

In this context, she also refers to Kieslowski’s confession that he made Weronika die 27 minutes after the film begins, just as Janet Leigh, the heroine of Psycho does. Insdorf suggests that by depicting Veronique ending her relationship with Alexandre, “Kieslowski seems to be questioning the combination of talent, love, opportunism, and perhaps guilt of the storyteller who uses real lives in his art.”

We can assume that Alexandre’s show about Veronique’s double life could achieve a certain success similar to that derived from Kieslowski’s film about her life. Alexandre must have sensed the potential success of the show based on her life, because, after all, he chose art rather than life. He could not resist making use of his girlfriend’s story, even if it risked ending their relation.

Coates considers Kieslowski’s whole oeuvre to be a “concealed autobiography,” commenting that “it seems at times as if all his films’ figures are speaking with his voice.” He names two levels through which the work may be said to be autobiographical. The first level concerns the fact that Kieslowski sometimes chooses subjects directly from his own experiences as a basis for the development of his films. Coates draws attention to the tendency for the “autobiography” to assume a mask in documentary formats, for we cannot see the editing stage where the director selects voices that reflect his own opinion from among the massive collection of material. The second level concerns feelings, and Coates regards this factor as operating on a deeper level than the first strategy of embodying the events on the surface. He considers that the feelings are probably based on childhood emotions of which even Kieslowski himself may not be wholly aware. He also detects a double life in Kieslowski’s transformation from a documentary filmmaker to a feature film director. He claims that the death of Kieslowski’s documentary age should rather mean a transformation for the director, considering that he employed the mystical regeneration of Veronique after Weronika’s death in his creation, The Double Life of Veronique.

As to the issue about which part of Kieslowski’s films is connected with his own experiences, Blue offers an example. In the film, there is a witness of the car crash which caused the deaths of Julie’s daughter and husband. Kieslowski says that the
witnessing character derives from his own experience of coming upon a similar accident. Car accidents are also found in other Kieslowski films such as No End and The Double Life of Veronique. In No End, the heroine’s husband dies from a car accident and there is a scene in the film where the heroine witnesses another car accident, which causes her to have a flashback of the traumatic experience of her husband’s death. In The Double Life of Veronique, Veronique’s boyfriend, Alexandre, chances to be in a café when a car crashes beside the road in front of the café, and Veronique also sees the crashed car when she visits Alexandre in the café. Eavesdropping on phone conversations is another recurring event in Kieslowski’s films. It appears not only in Red but also in Decalogue 9 and in No End. Kieslowski had actually experienced having his phone conversations eavesdropped by his neighbour, according to Insdorf’s citation of her interview with the director. Kieslowski admits that he also peeps and eavesdrops, too, but only on his characters and not in his life. It is also notable that Kieslowski himself had had serious heart condition similar to that of Weronika and Veronique in The Double Life of Veronique as well as Ola in Decalogue 9.

There are opposite cases where his experiences derive their source in his works: some of his films turn out to ‘double’ his own life after production. One of his documentaries, First Love, provides an example for doubling the director’s life. Kieslowski reveals in Kieslowski on Kieslowski about how his own life is doubled in the 1974 filming of First Love. He notes that when he filmed a young couple, Jadzia and Romek, from the time when Jadzia was four months pregnant until she bore a baby, he had a feeling of deja vu. Jadzia and Kieslowski’s wife, Maryska, bore infants around the same time. When Kieslowski went to film the young couple in the hospital, he realised that Romek was standing outside the same window in the same yard, just as he, Kieslowski, once had done in order to see his own wife. It is at this moment that he had a feeling of deja vu. Acknowledging that he is a little confused about the order of the events, he says that he thinks he and his wife had their daughter a little earlier than the couple in the film. Without planning, his film turned out to overlap his life. However, in this case, it is possible that he chose the subject of birth unconsciously from his fresh experience of his own daughter’s birth.

Insdorf refers to the striking resemblance between Olivier in Blue, performed by a French actor, Benoit Regent, and Krzysztof Piesiewicz, the Polish co-scriptwriter of Kieslowski. She mentions not only that they are similar in appearance but also that they
bear a comparable relation with their masters' creations after their deaths. That is, Olivier tries to finish Patrice's composition after his death, just as Piesiewicz is trying to complete Kieslowski's unfinished script of the Heaven / Hell / Purgatory, a project which the two colleagues had begun after the completion of Kieslowski's last film, Red, despite Kieslowski's declaration of retirement. Furthermore, Insdorf associates the director's work with the perception and creative processes of a composer. According to Jacques Witta, the editor of Blue, they made thirty versions of the film with different constructions, and it continued "transforming and progressing."144 Referring to the process of editing the film, Insdorf says that Kieslowski himself "became a true 'composer' - arranging and rearranging the strips of celluloid like the musical notes that he said 'all exist, waiting for someone to order them.'"145 Moreover, the cause of his death was a heart attack during a by-pass operation, in the midst of his career, as if to repeat Weronika's fate.

These coincidences above are apparently unplanned instances of doubleness. Even if Kieslowski himself had been aware of the fatality of his heart condition, who would have predicted his sudden death not long after his completion of the Three Colours? After Red, he announced his retirement from the film industry. However, it seems not to have been easy for him to leave the profession in which he had spent so much time and effort. Kieslowski confesses: "It's not that simple to sever contacts with everything that you've done for the past years." He kept in touch with film-related works such as writing scripts, seeing young filmmakers and giving lectures on his films around the world, despite his initial hope of "sitting at home and smoking cigarettes."146 His following comment on one of his characters, Julie in Blue, holds truth in his own attempt to separate himself from his past life: "it appears that you can’t free yourself entirely from everything that’s been."147 Like Julie, he could not leave his past despite his will to do so. In the end, he had begun working on another trilogy, the Heaven / Hell / Purgatory project. He had planned to work on the script with his long-term co-scriptwriter, Piesiewicz, and then to hand the work of directing to some younger film directors. Referring to the director's announcement of retirement, Insdorf poses a question associated with one of his characters, Mikolaj in White: "Was he staging his own professional death in order to be born again?"148 But how could he stage his own physical death? Insdorf cites Kieslowski's comment on his retirement at a Boston Press Conference: "A train is going somewhere, and the car of film is very crowded. In order
for others to get on, some one has to get off to make room." He gave his admirers only a brief moment of delight by the news that he would return to the film industry with his Heaven / Hell / Purgatory. His premature death has inevitably made "room" in the "car of film." However, unlike the man who is commonly noted as a pessimist, he might have been too optimistic about finding someone else to fill in the great space he has left.
I wrote Cul de Sac during the first semester in 1999. It is a play of some 3,000 words, and was performed in “Putting on an Act, ’99” at PICA in July 1999. The show is directed by myself. The cast of actors are: myself as Meika; Kerry Leigh for the old woman; Elissa Snowden for the dead woman; Linda Scotti for the little girl; and Luke Martindale for Meika’s father. The sound effects are designed by James Odea. The performance goes for about 20 minutes. The main character, Meika, is born of a Japanese mother and an English father in London. She is separated from her beloved father at the age of five, when her parents divorce. Her mother brought her up in Japan, and consequently she was not able to see her father. Her mother only spoke ill of her father and this attitude caused conflict in her relationship with her mother. Now Meika is approaching her middle age. She returned to London after her mother’s death. She had made every effort to find her father, however, the search proved to be in vain. She is married and has a full-time job. However, she is still suffering from the sense of loss caused by the forced separation with her father. After years of disappointment of not seeing her father again, she has become pessimistic about her life and is verging on severe alcoholism.

The play begins just after one of her daily arguments with her husband, Nick. She has been drinking particularly heavily that day, and finds herself lost in the back streets of London, in a deserted dead alley surrounded by apartments and warehouses no longer used. She is struck with a strange sense of familiarity about the place, but she cannot remember why. She begins to sing a Japanese song that she had forgotten for a long time. It is a children’s song to accompany a bouncing ball game. Half way through the song, she finds that she cannot remember the next line. She slowly takes out a knife from her handbag, suggesting her desire to commit suicide. Then she hears someone grumbling. Startled, she finds an ugly old woman wrapped in a rug appearing from around a corner of the alley. Meika is disgusted by the sight of the woman and tries to step away, only to stumble on something else. Her first reaction is to complain about people’s behaviour, as she always does, whenever things do not go well for her. Then she finds that she actually stepped on a dead body of some woman about her age. She asks the old woman for help, even though the woman does not show as much interest as Meika had expected. She is overwhelmed with the despair of death and begins to shiver.
Before long, she hears a child sobbing. She finds a little girl crying, sitting on one of the apartment steps. She feels sympathy towards the girl and asks what her problem is. When the girl looks up at her, she feels that she has seen the girl somewhere before. Trying to console the girl, Meika sings the Japanese song that she tried to sing earlier, remembering the whole song this time. The girl reveals that she has been left alone, after one of her parents’ arguments. The girl’s story triggers Meika’s memory of a similar traumatic experience in her own childhood. There is a flashback of her playing hide and seek with her father. Meika as a girl looks like the girl she just met. After the flashback, she finds that her eyes are filled with tears, experiencing a sadness that she had not felt for a long time. She looks for the girl and discovers that she has gone. Then she sees her father not far away from her. With a surprise and joy, she calls to him. He only asks what her problem is. She explains to him that she met a lost child but that now she is gone. Her father says that maybe the girl has found her way home. His words console her deeply, but the next moment, he disappears. She cries for him in vain.

Meika wakes up to the sound of morning in the city. She looks at her watch and takes out her mirror to put on some make up. She looks into her mirror image for a while, then, gives a subtle smile. She leaves the alley as if embracing a new day. From behind, we hear the girl and the old woman playing together with a bouncing ball, singing the Japanese song. In the end, she realises that she had a dream and that it took place in the area where she was brought up as a child. She also realises that all the characters in the story are her doubles.

The main theme of the play is that someone who has been lost in her life finds her way to live positively through encounters with her doubles. The old woman is the image of Meika that she would become if she continued with the same attitude as expressed at the play’s beginning, like a living corpse who knows nothing other than attributing all her problems to someone else than herself, such as her husband. The dead woman is her figure in the instance that she really committed suicide. It is not until she is faced with real death that she realises how thoughtless her idea was. At this point, her mind begins to think of some positive ways to keep on living: was there really nothing that she could do to solve her problem? Through encountering the little girl, Meika realises that she had forgotten about her childhood, forgotten the little innocent girl who simply cried when she was sad and who laughed when she was happy. The father’s character is also part of Meika herself, since he is a figure in her dream. She finally convinces herself.
that even if she could not find her father in real life, she can still be with him in a sense. In the end, what counts is perception rather than actual circumstances.

The relation between Meika and the old woman resembles that of Joseph and Auguste in *Red*. In the film, the old man sees his young self in Auguste, while in *Cul de Sac*, the main character meets her old self. Both cases are based on the question of “what if...?” What if Meika could see her future self? What if Joseph could watch his younger self re-making his life? The same idea applies to the figure of the dead woman. What if Meika really committed suicide, and she could see herself? Only the little girl is exception from this condition. She is from the past, which establishes the basis for the present Meika. The emergence of childhood appears in *Blue*, as well. The heroine, Julie, suddenly suffers from a childhood fear of mice that she had forgotten about for a long time. We often forget things in our past, but they do not disappear. Rather, they seem only to sink deeper into our inner world, ready to re-emerge when some circumstance stirs them. The Japanese song in *Cul de Sac* is also a recollection from Meika’s past. The fact that she cannot remember the whole song at first shows her dismissal of a foundational part of herself and gives a clue to her need to confront and solve the problems in her present life.

*Cul de Sac* also explores self-identity in relation to the person’s cultural background. The main character has a sense of insecurity about her existence, since she is not sure where she belongs. She was born in London and brought up in that city up to the age of five. She then spent the rest of her childhood in Japan, where she alienates herself from the culture partly due to her problem with her Japanese mother. However, when she finally comes back to her apparent hometown, London, she cannot feel a sense of belonging any more. In part, her sense of isolation is due to changes in the city, but the most important factor is her inability to find her father, which causes her to detach herself from any one and any place. Home for Meika lies in the perception of childhood in her mind, which makes the very foundation of her life as an adult. As long as she avoids confronting her problems derived from her traumatic childhood, she is only alienating herself from everything around her. The appearance of the little girl and flashback in the play lead her to realise this perception. This part of the story is based on my present situation of living in a foreign country. Kieslowski also produced his later works outside his home country. *The Double Life of Veronique* and *White* both take place in Poland and France. *Blue* takes place in France, and *Red* in Switzerland. It is surprising to know that, despite his great co-productions with the French, Kieslowski
did not understand their language. However, in an interview by Paul Coates, he says that language is not an obstacle for mutual understanding between people.153

The story of Cul de Sac partly derives from my studies on multiple personality disorder. Reading many biographical writings about people with the disorder, I found them not just about very special people and I felt the need to express an incipient multiplicity in people in general through stories. During the course of therapy, people with multiple personality disorder uncover all the personalities they have inside themselves; the process of their integration, which is the goal for the therapy, only begins with the recognition of this multiplicity. It seemed to me that it is also important for people without the condition to explore inner multiplicity in order to know themselves better. I decided to represent personality multiplicity by creating double figures of the main character. The doubles are designed to be performed by different actors as an incarnation of parts of the heroine’s inner world. I also adopted the idea of setting the scene in a dream, for dreams seem to be one of those places where one’s doubles tend to appear though still within the category of daily life, and therefore the dream frame would appear to be acceptable for the general audience. For example, the kind of double in a story such as The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde by Stevenson is physically supernatural. In contrast, anything is possible in dreams. In a way, every character in our dream is a double of ourselves, since every character is produced in one’s mind. A different approach towards the idea of double is explored in my next play, Requiem.
Chapter 2 Requiem

The main issues of Requiem are the integration of live piano performance into a dramatic context, the quest for one's identity through exploring psychological multiplicity and childhood, and the conflict and positive interrelation between two different cultures. The play incorporates both classical piano solo and duo performances. The story evolves around a Euro-Asian girl named Shelley who was taken to England after her parents' deaths when she was young. She was born as a Siamese twin and her sister, Shannon, had to die so that at least Shelley could survive. This girl created the personality of her dead sister through her lonely and severe childhood. They often enjoy each other's company while sharing one body. However, when their objectives collide with each other, their life becomes a disastrous chaos. The conflict between these two egos becomes clearer when Shelley deals with other characters in the play: her uncle, aunt and her piano teacher. As her relations with these people develop, it affects her inner connection with Shannon deeply. In the process of finding her identity, the story also traces back in memory to her childhood in Japan, which is presented with some use of Japanese music and language. In relevance of music, the piano is the centre of the life of Shelley and Shannon. Their contrastive ways of performing and interpreting the music will help to bring out their different characteristics vividly.

Requiem was performed in the Music Auditorium at WAAPA@ECU, from 29 September to 1 October for four shows including a matinee, as part of Artrage Festival 2000, an annual performance festival in Perth City. Shelley and Shannon are performed by myself; Mr. Jeremy McDowell, the heroine's uncle, by Joe Isaia; Mrs. Valerie McDowell by Lucy Eyre; and Mr. Andrew Stevens, a piano teacher, by Lucien Crotty. The play is directed by myself with the help of a consultant-director, William McCluskey; lighting design by Alex Dick; and stage management by Brian Preston. Previously, a condensed short scene of the play was performed as part of a group presentation by Master of Creative Arts' students at WAAPA @ ECU at a performing arts research conference, “Double Dialogues - Culture Wars” held by Deakin University and Victorian College of the Arts in Melbourne in April, 2000.

The project is innovative, firstly, in terms of the role of music performance in the context of drama. The music functions as a medium for communications between the split personalities of the protagonist and from her to other characters in the play and to
the audience. It reveals what she has in mind and which personality she is in at that moment. Secondly, the play is based on a paradoxical notion that the pursuit of the identity can be achieved through the recognition of inner split-ness, and the idea is deliberately brought into a shape by combining the concept of multiple personality disorder with the case of Siamese twins. Here the psychiatric and medical problems are introduced to the audience as something to which they could relate within their individual context. Another novelty of this play lies in the fact that it is written by someone whose mother tongue is not English. The protagonist’s strife in a foreign land is that of the writer herself, for whom the piano is also a great alternative for communicating with people of different cultural backgrounds.

Requiem is an integrated work of music and drama. After putting on Cul de Sac, I felt like experimenting more with non-verbal language in the next work. The idea of adopting classical music naturally came to my mind because of my classical music background. I have been interested in performing classical music in a different context from that of classical concerts and in highlighting how dramatic classical music can be. When I came across a new piece of music during the course of my piano tuition, I sometimes felt a story arise from the music itself. Also I was interested in the change in myself when I performed pieces with contrastive characters. Beethoven’s works, for instance, are rich in contrasts such as a sudden change from *piano* to *forte*, or from tenderness to aggression, as too are Chopin’s Scherzos and Nocturnes. Once during a piano class, a teacher told us that when the music changes, we have to draw another personality out of ourselves. That is exactly what I had discovered, when I performed pieces with great internal contrasts. The colour in the music needs to be changed in an instant, and the performer cannot drag the feeling from the previous part on to the new section. A few years ago, I played Beethoven’s *Appassionata* in a piano students’ concert. The music consists of three movements; the first and third movements are passionate, while the second movement is very quiet. After the performance, my friends told me that they were amused to see me play different characters in the various movements and, accordingly, to discover new aspects in my personality that they had never seen before.

I decided to apply my experience of personality change in music performance to the performance of the split personality of Shelley and Shannon. Each of their performances and choice of music reflect their character. In brief, Shelley plays quiet, peaceful music, while Shannon plays passionate, at times, aggressive music. Chopin’s
Scherzo No.1 gives a good example. This piece consists of mainly two parts. The main part is a very fast, passionate part, signified as *Presto, con Fuoco*, and the other part is inserted in the middle, which is very slow and quiet, originally deriving from a Polish lullaby. Shelley loves the middle lullaby part and she does not have enough passion to play the other part of the music. In contrast, Shannon omits the middle section when she plays the piece, finding the melody too boring. She is filled with an urge to run her fingers on the keyboard to express herself. Shannon also loves Beethoven’s music, and her favourites include *Pathetique* mov.1 and 3, *Moonlight* mov.3, *Appassionata* mov.1 and 3, *Tempest* mov.1 and 3. She likes mostly the first and third movements of Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas, for generally they are fast and passionate, while the middle movement is slow and quiet. Her playing can be said to be lacking the subtlety that Shelley’s performance has. Shannon is so energetic and runs into the next notes, while Shelley likes to dwell on each note and in between the notes. Shannon has more technical skills than Shelley, while Shelley exceeds Shannon in subtle expressiveness.

When a young pianist, Andre Stevens, brings Shelley the opportunity to perform Rachmaninoff’s *Fantasy* for four hands in a concert, both Shelley and Shannon love the tune. However, Shannon places obstacles within Shelley’s efforts to learn the music, at one time by beginning to play a totally different music, *Moonlight* mov. 3. Shannon is not happy about the fact that Shelley has found a music partner, with whom Shelley also falls in love. Shannon also is afraid of the situation where people begin to pay attention to Shelley. If Shelley would become famous, for instance, as a pianist, no one would be aware that there is another personality involved called Shannon Norton. She even disturbs Shelley’s practice with Mr. Stevens by starting to play a totally different tune than the Rachmaninoff. However, in the end, she decides to wish for Shelley’s happiness.

In this play, I wanted to shed some light on the dual or multiple layers in other characters’ psychology as well as Shelley’s. In case of Jeremy, the uncle, he generally does not act with strength and tends to be under the control of his wife. However, he is actually a very secure person. He knows that Valerie’s tendency to put other people down is due to her being unable to trust herself. Therefore, he would rather obey her for trifling matters in order to avoid conflicts. When the problem is serious, he takes decisive action, as when he finds Valerie attacking the sick Shelley because of her own problem. He is generally supportive of Shelley, but sometimes acts strongly in front of her, as in the scene where he pushes Shelley to get ready for Valerie’s birthday party. It
is only because he is under pressure from Valerie, a weakness that tends to emerge in people generally. He and Shelley establish a relationship like that of a father and a daughter, that becomes clear in the scene of Shelley’s nightmare, where her father’s character appears with Jeremy’s appearance.

The psychological duality/multiplicity is particularly evident in Valerie McDowell. She has clearly different faces for people external to the domestic environment, like her customers and a stranger, Mr. Stevens, and for those people within her home, such as her husband and Shelley. She has a sweet face for the outside and a tyrant aspect for the inside. Her profession as a cosmetic sales woman represents this part of her character. It is notable that Kieslowski refers to the same issue in discussing his work, Decalogue. He says, “I think that all people . . . have two faces. They wear one face in the street, at work, in the cinema, in the bus or car. . . . That’s the appropriate face to wear on the outside, and the appropriate face for strangers.”155 However, she has not only these two faces for there is a deeper part of her identity of which she herself is not very aware. It appears towards the end of the play. She has actually suffered from her relationship with her father. Her father was a severe music teacher and wanted his daughter to become a great musician. She did her best and practiced the piano very hard every day. However, she could not achieve her father’s dream. She failed the examination for entrance in a prestigious music course. This is the very course to which Shelley is offered a scholarship later. Mrs. McDowell’s father did not have enough understanding of the situation, and insulted her by ignoring all her efforts, picking solely on her faults. Her father died soon after her marriage. After all, she could not achieve good relationship with him and this failure has caused her suffering ever since his death.

Because of such a background, Valerie is jealous of Shelley’s talent in music as well as of the support given to her from Jeremy McDowell. Valerie’s attitude towards Shelley becomes even harsher, as Shelley gets opportunities from Mr. Stevens. We see her limitation, when Mr. Stevens offers a music scholarship for Shelley to study in an institution where Valerie herself failed to be enrolled. She begins swearing at Shelley who is sick in bed, saying such things as she has no talent in music and all her practice goes nowhere. However, she is actually talking about herself. After Jeremy cuts in on her attacking Shelley, Valerie changes the second person singular of her speech into the first person singular, while bursting into tears. We see her vulnerability for the first time. Jeremy tells Shelley that he saw her father only once and had no idea about their painful relationship. Shelley also feels sorry for her, for although she lost her father when she
was little, she has all good memories of him.

This scene is also important as a farewell moment between Shannon and Jeremy. The irony is that she leaves him when he finally believes that Shannon really exists. At this stage, Shannon no longer appears as strong as before, demonstrated through the way in which she kisses him. She no longer flirts with him, but gives him a shy, quick kiss on his cheek. The scene leads into the above-mentioned scene where Shannon cries for the first time. Here, the dual aspect of Shannon’s personality is revealed. Under her aggressive surface has been hidden a very sensitive, vulnerable and affectionate part of Shannon. Shannon finally decides to leave Shelley’s body and the music which Shelley and Mr. Stevens play at the end becomes a Requiem for Shannon: Requiem, “a music for the repose of the soul of the dead.” When they play Tears, the third movement of Fantasy by Rachmaninoff, towards the end of the play, Shannon finally cries. She is, at last, able to accept all her feelings that she had kept hidden in order to act with strength to protect Shelley and herself. She cries because what she really wanted is to play with Shelley, which is impossible because of her lack of a body. She reaches the conclusion that if she really loves her sister, she should let her live her own life. Finally, Shannon becomes integrated with Shelley, which inevitably brings Shelley face to face with the loss of her relationship with Shannon. Shelley has to begin a new phase of life by herself.

The main difference between the above-mentioned two plays, Cul de Sac and Requiem is that the former explores the doubleness as an autoscopy of the main character, while the latter presents the heroine’s inner double personality. This difference appears clearly in the use of actors in these two plays: in Cul de Sac, different actors perform multiple aspects of the protagonist, Meika; in contrast, in Requiem, the same actress plays the both sides of the doubleness, Shelley and Shannon. However, it is common in both plays that the main character discovers unknown aspects of herself though interacting with her double figure. To explain the idea in the concrete terms: Meika initially tends to take things from a very narrow perspective, until she realises that there is more potential in life than she had thought. By witnessing different parts of herself through the physical entities as her doubles, she is able to observe herself from an objective viewpoint. In Shelley’s case, she has perceived her doubleness as a separate entity from herself and considered Shannon as an independent person rather than part of herself. However, she cannot avoid confronting the essential problem of lacking a body, particularly when the two egos of Shelley and Shannon are in conflict with each other.
In the end, she learns to accept Shannon as part of herself, which brings about their integration and a new phase in her life.

There is another doubleness involved during the process of producing the plays. It is a doubleness born between scriptwriting and staging of the text. As soon as the rehearsals with the actors began, the characters in the text gain not only a physical entity but also another life. The characters become transformed from their figures in the scriptwriter’s mind, with the metamorphosis depending on each actor. Such perception is nothing new. However, even if I had understood before, such transformations were still a fresh and fascinating experience for me. When I first saw the characters, which I had known only within my mind, begin to physically move in front of me, I gained another impression of the characters. I could feel the characters, who were born in my mind and seemingly belonged only to myself, begin to live in the actors and therefore become part of them. When the play is performed, the characters are transferred to each member of the audience in a different shape, which adds another level to the doubleness of the characters. This is probably the most fascinating aspect of theatre creation, at least for me, seeing the generation and regeneration of characters in the actors, audience and myself which creates layer upon layer of doubleness.
Conclusion

The notable characteristic of the doubles in Kieslowski’s films is that they are more directed to connections rather than confrontations between people. As is mentioned in the “Introduction,” the theme of doubleness is treated in a different way in Kieslowski’s films than in general films dealing with the issue. The doubles in his films are not so contrastive as black and white or as good and evil and the two halves do not end up in tragic conflict as in classical stories about doubles. In the case of Weronika and Veronique in The Double Life of Veronique, the focus is rather on sharing: the two women not only resemble each other but they also share a love of music, both have beautiful voices and similar heart conditions and, more significantly, both share an intuitive sense of connection with someone else in the world. Above all, they share the wisdom gained from their life experiences. When Weronika dies from a heart attack while singing in a concert, the wisdom gained from her death is transferred to Veronique through a mysterious connection, so that Veronique can survive by choosing to relinquish a singing career and pursue, instead, her love for music through becoming a music teacher.

Some characters experience a sense of fulfilment from a sense of interconnectedness that can be achieved only through the mediation of a double. In Red, Joseph can realise his dream to be united with his true love represented by Valentine, through his double, Auguste. Let us remember the director’s motivation in creating this film: “It would be lovely if we could go back to the age of twenty. How many better, wiser things we could have done! But it’s impossible. That’s why I made this film.”156 Joseph cannot undo what he has done in his life. However, he can observe his younger self embarking on a better life than he has led. In A Short Film about Love, Magda, who is too late in realising the meaning of Tomek’s pure love, can gain his love again merely in her imaginative double of Tomek: the picture is far from the reality. As Coates points out, “the image of comfort is available only through a magical fusion of memory and imagination, and the two are in fact separate here and now, in Tomek’s room.”157 In No End, it is not until her husband dies that Urszula realises that she deeply loves him. Now, only through her own death can the heroine be reconnected with her husband again. Here, death does not appear as a dead end; rather, death carries within itself a sense of rebirth. The couple are given another chance to fulfil their love through their deaths. As Weronika’s wisdom is transferred on to Veronique after her death, the hero’s
wisdom of love may have been sent to his wife when he died. The heroine senses that her husband is still with her, although she cannot see him basically, which is similar to Veronique’s intuition about her double.

In a sense, the word, “double” can simply mean not being single and/or alone. It can suggest another possibility, a second chance. Weronika is given another chance to survive through Veronique and Joseph is given a second chance to realise his dream through Auguste. In Blue and in White, the main characters recover themselves and achieve love through their transformations after experiencing a disastrous event: they start a new life by focusing on new aspects of themselves with which to fight their way out of the predicament. Julie may not have survived if she did not arm her vulnerability with an intentionally transformed self as a person who is indifferent to the past. Karol manages to attain another face than the one that he had worn as a hairdresser, enabling him to establish a fortune for the sake of equality with his ex-wife. These films may show how fragile life is but, at the same time, they seem to suggest that there is a great potential within us of which we may not have been aware. If we look at things through the perspective of doubleness, we may be able to access a clearer view of hidden possibilities.

“Double” may also be seen as a mysterious medium in-between the sphere of the self and that of otherness. A double has an essential connection with oneself. However, a double is distinguishable from the original self. For instance, in my work, Cul de Sac, the main character has no idea that she is seeing her doubles when they initially appear. Only at the end, when she reflects on everything that has happened to her during the night does she recognise aspects of her self in the enigmatic figures that she has encountered. Similarly, this characteristic of doubleness can be argued as arising in the relationship between the audience and the recurring old woman who appears to need some help in Three Colours and in The Double Life of Veronique that we have examined in Chapter Two. Many viewers may see the character merely as a strange old woman. However, as is suggested by Kieslowski, she can be taken as a future double of each member of the audience. Hence, on the one hand, a stranger can be, through the idea of doubleness, someone who reflects yourself and, on the other hand, you may find an unknown self within yourself. The notion of doubles seems to help forge connections between people as well as catalyse processes of self-discovery.

These two points also seem to be what Kieslowski pursues in his work. Kieslowski notes the importance of finding oneself in a film in Kieslowski on Kieslowski: “If film
really means to achieve anything - at least, this holds true to me - then it’s that somebody might find him or herself in it.” He reveals that when he and his co-scriptwriter, Piesiewicz, were working on the protagonists for Decalogue, they tried to create characters that are so credible that the audience could think: “I’ve been in that position. I know exactly how they feel,” or “Something very similar occurred to me once.” Kieslowski also emphasises the fact that he makes films “on a small scale” rather than “on a macro scale” because of his concern with individual people’s lives. Paradoxically, his films about the very inner lives of individual people on a micro scale have succeeded in achieving universality.

In a review of The Double Life of Veronique, the author says, “Krzysztof Kieslowski serves us pieces from our own life’s puzzle.” Kieslowski manages to achieve this effect through presenting us stories about feelings, about emotions. Even though particular situations presented in his films may be different from that of our own lives, we seem to have had the same kind of feelings that the main character goes through. On a spiritual level, such films could be about our own life. The following episode revealed by Kieslowski seems to demonstrate such a case. Kieslowski says that one day a woman recognised him in a street in Berlin and began to cry. She said to him that she had not communicated with her daughter for five or six years, although they were sharing an apartment. But when they went to see Kieslowski’s A Short Film about Love the previous day, the daughter gave her a kiss for the first time after the years of estrangement. Kieslowski suggests that the mother or the daughter probably found the reason provoking their problem “lurked somewhere” in the film. He says: “It was worth making the film for that kiss, for that one woman.”

There are further examples of the audience’s demonstrations of self-discovery through Kieslowski’s films. Kieslowski says that he received many letters after his earlier feature film, Camera Buff, that made comments like, “How do you know how it’s like to be a film buff? It’s a film about me. You made a film about me.” He also received letters after his other films, claiming, “You’ve plagiarised my life. Where do you know me from?” There was even a boy who sent him a letter that the film, A Short Film About Love, had been taken from his life. I was fortunate enough to experience similar reaction to my own theatrical work. When I presented part of Requiem at the performing arts research conference, “Double Dialogues - Culture Wars” in Melbourne, a lady came up to me after the performance and said that it touched her in a very
personal way and that she found some of my character’s words repeating the exact thoughts that she has had before. I was very happy to hear such a comment since, although I chose a highly peculiar background for the main character of being born as a Siamese twin, I wanted to convey the ubiquity of duality in human psychology to the general audience through the condensed case of the heroine with a double personality.

Although it would depend on each viewer in which character in Kieslowski’s films he/she would see their own reflection, some characters seem to function as a double to the general audience through its common characteristics. Paul Coates associates Tomek with a section of the audience typically choosing to sit in the front row: “He is as it were a front-row viewer who wants a closer look. He wants to enlarge the image.” In this sense, the audience is watching their double in the film. A similar statement can be said about Alexandre in The Double Life of Veronique, who peeps into Veronique’s personal story about her double to satisfy his curiosity. The audience of the film may even peep further into her life than Alexandre through an invisible camera installed in her private space. Similarly, we might be as interested in eavesdropping as in the case of the retired judge in Red.

As is mentioned in the discussion of the relationship between the director and his doubles in Chapter 3.2, the film medium itself adds another layer of doubleness to Kieslowski’s films, which contain doubleness of various kinds within themselves. The characters presented in films are the ghostly doubles of the actors who have performed in front of the camera and who are no longer there. Moreover, not only the characters but also the whole film world which appears vividly in front of the audience is what is “artificially doubled on celluloid” through the perspective of the director. The doubled film reality regenerates itself through a projector in a different space and time, every time the film is screened.

Through this paper, numerous kinds of doubleness have been examined through Kieslowski’s films and my theatre practice, which may have revealed the connections not only within the created world but also in between the real world and the created through exploring the relationship between characters, creators, and viewers. Kieslowski says, “If culture is capable of anything, then it is finding that which unites us all. . . . Feelings are what link people together, because the word ‘love’ has the same meaning for everybody. Or ‘fear’, or ‘suffering’. . . . That’s why I tell about these things, because in all other things I immediately find division.” Through his films, Kieslowski may be reminding us of how many things there are that we share. Most
importantly, perhaps an awareness of doubleness can lead us to discover the otherness within ourselves so that we can become more aware of the mysterious connections between each other beyond time and space.
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After finding about Patrice’s girlfriend, Julie wonders what would have happened if she accepted the file: “If I had taken it, I would have known. And if I had burnt it, I would never have known.” Here is repeated again one of the most frequent themes in Kieslowski’s films, “what if...?”
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The frequent use of reflections in *The Double Life of Veronique* is discussed in relation to the theme of doubleness in Chapter One.

Moreover, what the audience believes as a body of a character in a film is often a collection of fragments of several actors' bodies, as Garbowski points out, noting the difference from the theatre where the protagonist's body is basically that of the actor visible on stage. (Garbowski, 36.) In the film world, it is not rare that they use stand-ins, who may be regarded as a partial double of the character, for action scenes or for performance scenes such as music or dance, for instance. Kieslowski says that he usually does not use stand-ins except for special circumstances such as in the case of Jean-Louis Trintignant who performed Joseph in *Red* who needed a stand man in rehearsal owing to his difficulty in walking. (Kieslowski, *Kieslowski on Kieslowski* 225.) *The Double Life of Veronique* offers another example. In the scene of Alexandre’s puppet show in Veronique’s school, according to Insdorf, the manipulating hands on the screen are those of a professional puppeteer, Bruce Schwartz. (Insdorf, 127.)
PART II

Chapter 1 Cul de Sac

The script of Cul de Sac is attached as "Appendix I."

It is interesting to see that there is the same kind of double in both Kieslowski's work and in my own, since I had not watched the film at the time that I wrote the script of Cul de Sac.
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Chapter 2 Requiem

The script of Requiem is attached as "Appendix II." The text differs slightly from the one used in the performance of the play owing to some alterations made to the original text during the rehearsal process.
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Cul de Sac

Maho Hidaka
SCENE ONE

A deserted chilly alley somewhere in London surrounded by musty apartments and warehouse no longer used. Litter around.

Set in darkness. Gradually dim lights come up.

MEIKA enters drunk, with a bottle of whisky in her hand. She looks fatigued, her hair is dishevelled and her office suit disordered. She is wearing high-heeled shoes and walks clumsily.

Meika: (While entering, cries out to invisible Nick off stage.) Fuck off, Nick! I’m fed up with you. (To herself,) Don’t know why I married such a bastard. (Drinks. Walks around while thinking.) Don’t know why..., but things always take a wrong turn.... (Sighing, looks up around.) Where am I? Lost. Got lost long time ago. Can’t find the way to.... (Drinks and seats herself on one of the steps of the apartments.) I do know this place. (Singing,) “Anta gata doko sa, Higo sa, Higo doko sa, Kumamoto sa, Kumamoto doko sa,.. Kumamoto doko sa....” Where is it? I don’t remember the next phrase. I knew it all when I was a child. (She takes out a small knife absent-mindedly and begins to play with it, pretending to cut herself.) I always take this knife with me. I’ve never done it, though. Not that there’s a lot to lose in this life. I just can’t take the last step. Maybe I’m too scared to go somewhere strange to me again. Still to know that I can leave here any time with this knife. (Laughs at herself.) Ironic. When I was young, I used to say, “I’ll never be like my mother,” and now I find myself stepping on the print of her wheel.

An OLD WOMAN appears from one of the comers of the alley with a bottle of whiskey. She is complaining of her life in a monotonous husky voice, distorting her face in an ugly way.

Old woman: Cold again. God. God’s never looked after me. I used to go to church, and I married in a church. I wonder why I married such an asshole?! Bloody church. Bloody husband....

Meika: (Feels unease at the sight of the woman.) Weird. Better to die than to expose a living corpse like that. (Brings the bottle to her mouth. She tries to escape from the woman, and steps on something.) What the hell is this? Should clean up their own fucking mess. (She kicks the object and finds it soft.) Jesus! (Brings her face closer to it, astonished.) Hey, you. Wake up, or you’ll be frozen to death. (There is no reply.) Hey, can’t you hear me? Come on....

MEIKA moves her face towards the lying woman to find it deadly pale and cold. She loses her breath.

Meika: Hey, you, you... wake up....
She lifts the woman's wrist to check her pulse, but it has already become rigid. Dried blood covers her arm.

The OLD WOMAN stays indifferent. She picks up a piece of newspaper to read it, then throws it away.

Old woman: Huh, shit happens.

Meika: ...Dead. SHE'S DEAD!! (She falls to her knees and holds her head, scared. Shivering.) Help me, ...help me, Pa.... (She hears the old woman still grumbling.) Hey, she's, ...she's dead!

Old woman: (Showing very little interest.) So what? We'll all be dead someday. Why cry about it? Eh?

Meika: We have to do something.

Old woman: What a noisy girl you are. What do you want? Isn't it you who said that it's better to die than sticking to life like me, eh?

Meika: But... but she's dead and....

Old woman: So? If she's dead, there's nothing to be done for her any more. Isn't it you who need help?

Meika: Yes...no, listen to me!! We have to find her family or somebody. You live here, don't you? Don't you know her??

Old woman: Don't you?

Meika: How could I know her? What do you mean??

The OLD WOMAN, however, had already began to leave MEIKA, with a mysterious cynical smile on her lips.

MEIKA, panicked by her words, looks more closely at the dead woman. The body turns back and faces her, touched by MEIKA. In her shock by the sight, she finds her own knife bloodstained.

Special comes up to the DEAD WOMAN and MEIKA.

Meika: Iyhaaaaaaaa!!!! (Silence.) I didn't do it. I didn't do it. Death. Death. (Crouching, she hugs herself firmly, shivering.) It's cold, it's so cold, Pa.... (Her knife slides down from her hand. Then she hears a child crying from darkness. She gets a little nervous.) Is there somebody there? (No answer. Then the child begins to cry again.)

MEIKA stands up and begins to move closer to the crying.

Stage lights gradually come up.
She finds a LITTLE GIRL crouching on one of the steps of the apartments, crying.

Meika: Hey, what’s the matter with you? (But the GIRL does not reply and keeps crying.) Don’t cry. What’s your name? Where’s your home?

The girl raises her head.

Meika: I know you.

The GIRL stares at MEIKA with her eyes filled with tears and raises her sensitive arm to point at MEIKA, which embarrasses her.

Meika: Me? Or your home is there? (MEIKA turns her head back to check where she pointed. But she finds nothing there. She turns her head to the GIRL again, to find the GIRL still gazing at her, as if to blame her for leaving her alone.) Who are you? Where do I know you from? (She cannot help pulling her eyes away from the gaze.) Don’t, don’t look at me so much. (She covers he face with her hands and cowers down next to the GIRL.) This alley.... I can’t find the last piece of this puzzle.

The GIRL begins to cry again very weakly, which draws MEIKA back from her own thoughts.


Little girl: (Nods at her.) What is the song about?

Meika: Well, “Anta gata doko sa” - this means “Where are you from?” And there’s an answer for it: “Higo sa” - “I’m from Higo.” Then, “Which part in Higo? It’s Kumamoto. Where’s Kumamoto? It’s in Senba.” These are all names of country regions in Japan. Then the song says, “There’s a raccoon dog in Mount Senba. And a huntsman shot it with a gun. He cooked it, boiled it, and that’s it.” (The GIRL chimes in and smiles at her.) I’d almost forgotten the song. When I was a little girl like you, I used to sing it while bouncing a ball. It’s a girls’ game in Japan.

Little girl: Are you from Japan?

Meika: (Pause.) No, I’m from London. But I had to spend part of my childhood in Japan.

Little girl: Why?

Meika: Because my parents didn’t get along well, and my mother took me to her country, Japan.

Little girl: Did they argue a lot?
Meika: Yeah.

Little girl: Mine, too. They argued again last night. The most scariest I’ve ever heard. Then they suddenly became quiet. And the silence scared me more. I can’t see what’s going on. Mother went to somewhere I don’t know. She looked angry, so I didn’t ask her. Better not to ask.... And Pa...., don’t know where he’s gone, either. I miss my Pa.

Meika: I know how you’re feeling. You often play ‘hide and seek’ with your Pa, don’t you? (The GIRL nods at her.) Me, too. And I always hid.

During the following monologue, lights begin to tighten up on MEIKA gradually (slowly excluding the GIRL out of the special, so that she can make the next action in darkness).

Meika: I was too scared to seek, in case I couldn’t find him. I remember the last time saw him. I was only 5 years old. Before he left, he kissed me on my forehead and said, “Meika, now you are old enough to play the role of ‘seeker’, aren’t you?” I wanted to say, “No.” But I couldn’t. Because he looked so sad. Nothing I could do about it. It was so cold. I felt as if I was falling down into deep dark sea. So dark that no one else can come and see me..... I found myself in another country. People were talking a language that I didn’t understand. It was good, though, ‘cause I didn’t have to reply to them. They let me alone. Except my mother. She came to me and said, “Here is my country, Japan, and you’ll live here with me from now on.” And though I didn’t ask about him, she said, “Your father didn’t want to come with you, so forget about him.” I knew it was not true. But it was enough to hurt me. I think all I learned from her is how to curse a man. She cursed my father from morning till night, whenever she looked at my face, as if to blame me. And I just kept saying inside, “No, no, no, it is not true. I know my pa, and I know him the best.” So I closed my ears to everything, my mouth, too. She began to call me an idiot, but I didn’t care, because I knew she couldn’t tell the truth. I kept my silence until she drowned herself, drunk. I was 21 years old at that time. I took her property - what there was of it, and left her country to go home. But I couldn’t find my home any more. I did everything that I could think of to find him. I learned to give up through those years. And I married the first man I met. Didn’t care who it was. I just wanted some change in my life. Huh, and still I have this miserable life with him. Too tired to change. ...And, ...and always missing... Pa, ...Pa....(She begins to hum the Japanese song and immerse herself in the recollection if the childhood with her father.)

A special is still on MEIKA. (The GIRL moves to downstage in darkness.)

Little girl: (In darkness.) Kyhaaa, ahhahahaha.....

Gradually separate light comes up on downstage.

FATHER enters the stage, running after the GIRL.

Little girl: No, Pa, no, you can’t find me. Uhuhuhuhu, ahhahaha....

Father: I caught you, Meika. Now it’s your turn to be the seeker.
Little girl: No. No, Pa, no. I won’t do it. You have to seek me.

Father: That’s not fair, Meika. I want to hide, too.


Father: You, naughty girl. Hahahahaha....

The light on downstage gradually fades out.

Little girl: Ahahahaha.... (She leaves the stage, while FATHER remains in darkness.)

The tears from her eyes draw MEIKA back from the recollection.

Meika: Tears.... I’d forgotten there were such things. (She looks at the space next to her.) Where is she?

MEIKA stands up and walks around to look for her. Instead she finds her FATHER smiling at her. (Special come up on him).

Meika: Pa.....

Father: (Smiling,) Meika, what are you looking for?

Meika: I found a lost child, Pa. She looks like me. But she’s gone....

Father: (In a soft, gentle voice,) Don’t worry. Maybe she’s found her way home.

MEIKA feels so relieved to hear her FATHER’s words. She looks up at him again, but he disappears. (The special on him fades out.)

Meika: Pa! Pa!!!

The special on MEIKA fades out.
SCENE TWO

Bright lights as morning sunshine come up.

Some environmental sound from morning city comes up together with the lights.

MEIKA is lying down alone in the alley. She wakes up and wipes the tears on her cheeks. The morning sunshine dazzles her eyes. She looks around and finds herself in an alley where she was in the dream that she had the night before.

MEIKA looks at her watch, and takes out a mirror from her bag to make up her face. She smiles at herself. Then she stands up. She turns her face back to the alley once on her way home and then leaves the stage. A bottle of whiskey is left behind.

As she leaves, a GIRL enters the stage, running after a ball. Then an OLD WOMAN follows.

Little girl: Ahahahaha....

Old woman: Wait for me, Meika.

The GIRL starts singing a Japanese traditional song, then the OLD WOMAN joins. The GIRL is bouncing a ball with rhythmical movements.

Little girl and old woman: (Singing,)

Anta gata doko sa, Higo sa,
Higo doko sa, Kumamoto sa,
Kumamoto doko sa, Senba sa.
Senba-yama niha tanuki ga otte sa,
Sore wo ryoushi ga teppo de utte sa,
Yaite sa, nite sa, sanosassa......
(Repeats.)

The lights begin to fade out gradually. Then their singing.
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It is set in a small town in England. All the scenes take place at the McDowells. The stage is set up side by side for a piano room with two pianos and a living room with a couch, a coffee table, and a phone. The piano room contains a bed and a mirror stand, and it functions as Shelley’s bedroom, as well.

SCENE ONE - A Visit from a Pianist -

SCENE 1-1 ~ On the Sea-Shore ~
(SHELLEY)

The light comes up on SHELLEY. She begins to play On the Sea-Shore by Smetana.

Shelley: (While playing, constantly pays attention at her mirror image on the piano.) My hands, your fingers.... (She touches her image, and returns back to the keyboard again.) When these hands play, is it me who plays? Or is it you....

Mr. STEVENS passes in front of SHELLEY’s place. He listens to her playing for a while, then leaves. The music fades away as the light goes.

SCENE 1-2 ~ On the Sea-Shore, Scherzo No.1 ~
(SHELLEY, Mr. & Mrs. McDOWELL, Mr. STEVENS)

The living room. The stage lights come up. Mr. McDOWELL is relaxing. Mrs. McDowell comes at the door.

Mr. McDowell: Hello.

Mrs. McDowell: Hello. My name is Valerie McDowell. Nice to meet you.

Mr. McDowell: Nice to meet you, too.

Mrs. McDowell: I’m from Nancy Parker Cosmetics. Today I brought you our most recent product called, ‘Fancy Feet’.

Mr. McDowell: I’m sorry but I don’t think....

Mrs. McDowell: Have you got a wife?

Mr. McDowell: Yes, I have a beautiful wife.

Mrs. McDowell: Great. (She goes into the house.) This is a product that you can use together. Night or morning, whenever you feel like. Let me just demonstrate it for you. No, no, it wouldn’t take long. Come here. Sit down.
Mr. McDowell: Thanks.

Mrs. McDowell: Feel good and look good with 'Fancy Feet'. Fancy Feet is a double action cream with natural abrasives, pumice and finely ground walnut shells so it can slough off dead, calloused skin when massaged on feet and leave them feeling smooth and soft. It's got a very sexy smell, as well. The best time to use Fancy Feet is after a bath, shower or footsoak. But of course you can use it any time you want. I'll show you. (She takes off her shoes and stockings.) Maybe you can do it to each other with your wife. Now leave on about 30 seconds, then massage until flakiness and dryness are removed. You can apply it to your legs, as well. Would you like to feel how it works? (She lets Mr. McDowell touch her legs.)

Mr. McDowell: Do you do this to other clients, too?

Mrs. McDowell: Maybe. See, like magic, your feet are left feeling smooth and soft.

Mr. McDowell: Jee, your hair is spiky.

Mrs. McDowell: Jez!

Mr. McDowell: Sorry, Valerie. I'm sure it's gonna work out O.K. You are doing it well, really. (Giggles.) I'm thirsty now. Do you want a drink?

Mrs. McDowell: I'm not thirsty.

Mr. McDowell: O.K.

Mr. Stevens appears at the door.

Mrs. McDowell does not react. Mr. McDowell gets to the door.

Mr. McDowell: Hello.

Mr. Stevens: Hello, my name is Andre Stevens. I'm a visiting artist from London for the....

Mrs. McDowell goes to the door.

Mrs. McDowell: Hello. I'm Valerie McDowell. Call me Valerie. Come in. I was just going to have some drink.

Mr. Stevens finds a pair of stocking on a couch.

Mr. Stevens: I am sorry if I disturbed you.

Mrs. McDowell: Oh, no. Not a problem. There's not much action happening around here.

Mr. McDowell: Hello. I'm Jeremy McDowell. (They shake hands.) So you are a visiting artist?
Mr. Stevens: Oh, yes. I'm a pianist for the coming music festival. I just wonder if I could see the pianist who is playing at your place. I am trying to find a piano partner for my concert.

Mrs. McDowell: Pianist?

Mr. Stevens: Yes. I was just passing in front of your house....

Mrs. McDowell: Oh, you mean that? She is not a pianist or anything. She is not even a music student.

Mr. Stevens: It doesn’t matter. Is it your daughter?

Mrs. McDowell: No, it’s my niece.

Mr. Stevens: I’d love to see her.

Mr. McDowell: Of course. Come along.

Mrs. McDowell: I’m afraid that there would be no point seeing her. She cannot even speak English properly.

Mr. Stevens: What do you mean?

Mrs. McDowell: My brother lived in Japan for a while and married one of the local girls.

Mr. Stevens: Oh, it doesn’t matter. Could I just see her, please?

Mr. McDowell: Why not? Just come this way.

SHELLEY begins to play the lullaby part of Chopin's Scherzo No.1.

Mr. Stevens: Thank you.

They go to the piano room.

SCENE 1-3 ~ Scherzo No.1, Barcarole~
(SHELLEY, Mr. & Mrs. McDOWELL, Mr. STEVENS)

Mr. & Mrs. McDOWELL and Mr. STEVENS are at the entrance of the piano room.

Mr. McDowell: Shelley!

The voice alerts Shelley and she stops playing.

Mr. & Mrs. McDOWELL and Mr. STEVENS come in.
Mr. McDowell: Shelley, this is....

Mr. Stevens: Stevens. Andre Stevens.

Mr. McDowell: Yes, this is Mr. Stevens. And this is Shelley, Mr. Stevens.

Mr. Stevens: Nice to meet you, Shelley.

Shelley: Nice to meet you.

Mr. Stevens: I'm sorry to visit you suddenly like this. But when I heard your playing, I thought I couldn't miss this chance. I'm a visiting pianist for the international music festival in the town, and I am supposed to perform a piano duo piece in one of the concerts. But last night, my duo partner suddenly became sick, and was hospitalised. I called around my colleagues to get someone to take her place, but I couldn't find anyone. I wonder if you would be interested in....

Mr. McDowell: That's great.

Mrs. McDowell: She can't do such a big job.

Shelley: That's our mother.

Mr. Stevens: Pardon?

Shelley: That's our mother.

Mrs. McDowell: (To SHELLEY.) I told you to stop using the words like that. It's not our mother, but my mother. Besides why are you talking about your mother now?

Shelley: Dad told me that she had an opportunity to perform in a concert, but she couldn't make it. She was too ill.

Mr. Stevens: Your mother was a pianist?

Mrs. McDowell: Not famous or anything.

Mr. Stevens: What's her name?


Mr. Stevens: I've heard of her name.

Shelley: Really?

Mr. Stevens: Yes. She was in London?

Shelley: Yes, for a year or two. She was studying in London Royal Academy of Music.

Mr. Stevens: That's where I am teaching.
Shelley: Is it?

Mr. Stevens: Yes.

Shelley: Our mother met Dad, while she was in the Academy. Dad was a cellist.

Mr. Stevens: Right. You must have learnt a lot from them, then. The music for the concert is *Fantasy* by Rachmaninoff. You may know the song already.

Shelley: I have never played any duo piece before.

Mrs. McDowell: You haven’t even performed in public.

Mr. Stevens: (To SHELLEY.) You don’t need to worry, Shelley. If you haven’t tried duo before, maybe this is a good opportunity to try it. Look, you’ve got two great pianos already.

Shelley: My mother left them to me in her will.

Mr. Stevens: Maybe this is a way of repaying your mother.

Shelley: ....

Mrs. McDowell: You’d better listen to her playing first, Mr. Stevens. She may get too nervous to perform in front of people. She usually locks herself in this room and just play for herself. She hasn’t even let me be her audience, you know.

Mr. Stevens: Oh, I’m sure she’ll be all right. (To SHELLEY.) But if you wouldn’t mind? I heard you play *Scherzo No. 1* by Chopin.

Shelley: No, I’m.... I’m....

Mrs. McDowell: See, she can’t.

SHANNON takes SHELLEY’s place.

Shannon: Excuse me.

SHANNON plays the second half of the *Scherzo* after the lullaby section.

Shannon: How’s that?

Mr. Stevens: Wow, you’ve got lots of energy. Why don’t you play the whole piece?

Shannon: That’s the whole piece for me.

Mr. Stevens: You missed the beautiful middle section, though? The part you were just playing when we came in.
Shannon: No, I don't play that part. Never.

Mr. Stevens: But you were playing it.

Mrs. McDowell: I'm ashamed to say, but she has a habit of lying, Mr. Stevens.

Shannon: I'm not a liar. (To Mrs. McDOWELL.) Isn't it you who's lying?

Mr. McDowell: Shelley.

Mrs. McDowell: How rude. I've never told a lie.

Shannon: That line proves that you are.

Mrs. McDowell: You see, Mr. Stevens. She's got some personality problem, as well. You wouldn't like that.

Mr. Stevens: Well.... (To SHELLEY) I'm just curious why you don't play the middle section. Don't you like it?

Shannon: Oh, if I tried it, I'd fall into a sleep.

Mr. Stevens: That's quite hard on Chopin. Do you know where the melody comes from?

Shannon: Are you thinking I'm an idiot? Of course it's from a Polish lullaby. Our mother used to play it for us in bed time.

Mr. Stevens: No wonder you get sleepy?

Shannon: Huh.

Mr. Stevens: Anyway, I'm convinced now that you are a fit partner for the concert.

Shannon: Can you convince me if you are fit enough for me?.

Mr. McDowell: Shelley!

Mr. Stevens: That's O.K. Well, I'll leave you the music any way, and we can try playing it together after you looked through it. You can tell me how you feel about it, then. How does that sound?

SHANNON leaves the spot to SHELLEY. SHELLEY does not seem to understand the situation.

Shelley: Eh.... I'm sorry but I don't understand.

Mrs. McDowell: (To Mr. STEVENS.) She is not very quick, you see.

Mr. Stevens: (To SHELLEY.) I said that I would leave you the music, and you can make your mind up when we see each other next time. O.K? You can give me a ring, when
you are prepared. Here is my card and the hotel number where I'm staying. Maybe early next week?

SHELLEY receives the music and the card as if they are something very strange. She nods almost absent-mindedly.

Mr. Stevens: See you soon, Shelley.

Mr. STEVENS and Mr. & Mrs. McDOWELL leave the room. They talk for a while in the living area. The stage lights fade, and a special comes on SHELLEY. She takes the music to the piano, and open the first page.

Shelley: Rachmaninoff, Fantasy. (She turns the page.) Barcarole.... (She reads a poem quoted for the song:)

"O cool evening wave
Lap gently under the oars of the gondola
...that song again! and again the sound of the guitar!
...in the distance, now melancholy, now happy,
Was heard the sound of the old barcarolle:
'The gondola glides through the water,
And time flies through love;
The waters become smooth again
And passion will rise no more.'

Lermontov."

She begins to play the part for the first piano.

SCENE 1-4 ~ Barcarole ~
(SHELLEY, Mrs. McDOWELL, Mr. McDOWELL)

The piano room. The stage lights come up. Mrs. McDOWELL comes back, and interrupts her playing. The door is left open.

Mrs. McDowell: Stop it, you silly girl. How could you call me a liar? (SHELLEY does not react to her.) Huh? (She comes up to SHELLEY, and tries to take up the music that Mr. Stevens gave her.) You don't need it, do you? (SHELLEY resists.) What's wrong with you? You'll just disgrace yourself on stage. How could you possibly play such a big role in front of lots of people? A lot more people than you've ever seen before. (She tries again to take away what SHELLEY is holding.) I cannot bear you being ashamed in public, you know.

Shelley: No!

Mrs. McDowell: No? No? What do you mean? I'm trying to help you.

Shannon: Help me? Huh. You make me laugh. You just are jealous of me, aren't you?
Mrs. McDowell: Jealous? You say I’m jealous of someone like you?!

Mr. McDOWELL comes in.

Mr. McDowell: What’s wrong?

Mrs. McDowell: Oh, Jez, she’s been lying again.

Mr. McDowell: (Sighs.) Is that true, Shelley?

SHELLEY comes back. She is scared of the whole situation, and just shakes her head in denial.

Mr. McDowell: Shelley says she hasn’t, Valerie?

Mrs. McDowell: Do you believe this idiot than me, Jez?!

Mr. McDowell: Valerie, just calm down.

Mrs. McDowell: I’m not upset! You always take sides with Shelley.

Mr. McDowell: No, I’m not taking anybody’s side. I’m just.... (Looks at his watch.) Oh, ‘Jerry Springer’ is on now. (To Mrs. McDOWELL.) You don’t wanna miss it, do you?

Mrs. McDowell: Shit. Can’t you videotape it?

Mr. McDowell: But we don’t have a video recorder.

Mrs. McDowell: Why not? (Turns to SHELLEY.) Isn’t this stupid? Two fucking pianos are taking up our space, when we don’t even have a video set. Might as well sell the....

Mr. McDowell: Valerie! Come on.

He takes her out of the room.

---

SCENE TWO - Discovery -

SCENE 2-1
(SHELLEY, Mr. & Mrs. McDOWELL)

Later that day. In the living room. The lights come up. Mr. & Mrs. McDOWELL are having drinks. SHELLEY is overhearing their conversation.

Mrs. McDowell: I gonna ring him, anyway.

Mr. McDowell: Who?

Mrs. McDowell: Mr. Stevens, of course. The pianist.
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Mr. McDowell: Why?

Mrs. McDowell: To let him know that she cannot take it.

Mr. McDowell: Leave her alone, Valerie.

Mrs. McDowell: Are you telling me what to do?

Mr. McDowell: No, I don't mean that. I just don't understand why you are so negative about it. It can be good for us too if she succeeds in her career. We may become rich, Valerie.

Mrs. McDowell: You are such an optimist. She is not normal.

Mr. McDowell: That's the point. They say, there's only a fine line between a genius and a fool, you know. Look how abnormal she is, it must be a sign of an extraordinary talent.

Mrs. McDowell: My god.

Mr. McDowell: Hey Valerie, I found an interesting thing about her.

Mrs. McDowell: What did you find?

Mrs. McDowell: You know that she locks herself in that piano room, and sometimes we don't hear her playing, right?

Mrs. McDowell: Yeah, I wonder what she's doing.

Mr. McDowell: I know what.

Mrs. McDowell: Oh, do you? What? What's she doing?

Mr. McDowell: She is talking to herself.

Mrs. McDowell: How do you know?

Mr. McDowell: It was about a month ago. I was mowing the grass, and I happened to look at the window of the piano room. And she was there, talking to the piano.

Mrs. McDowell: Talking to the piano? How odd! Oh, a spooky Siamese....

Mr. McDowell: Valerie.

Mrs. McDowell: It was really right that we decided not to have a baby, wasn't it?

Mr. McDowell: I didn't really mind a couple....
Mrs. McDowell: No way, Jez. Imagine if the baby had two heads and three arms. You know how much trouble my brother had because of them.

Mr. McDowell: Valerie, she may hear that.

Mrs. McDowell: Never mind. She must be talking to the piano again. (Laughs.)

Mr. McDowell: That's true.

SHELLEY leaves the spot. The lights on the living room fade out. Special comes on SHELLEY in the piano room.

SCENE 2-2 ~ Tears, Moonlight Sonata, mov.3 ~
(SHELLEY, Mr. McDOWELL)

The piano room. SHELLEY at the piano.

Shannon: Bastards!

Her face changes from anger to sadness. The border between SHELLEY and SHANNON becomes unclear for a moment.

Shannon: We didn’t have three arms. We just had two heads, didn’t we, Shelley?

Shelley: ...That doesn’t seem to matter much any more. We have only one head now. One head, two arms, two legs: one body. Shannon, what are we gonna do for the rest of our life? I mean, people see us as one person, a girl called ‘Shelley’. Dad was the only one who treated us as two. Now we have to behave as if we are one person. No one would understand how we really are; how I really am. I sometimes feel as if I’m deceiving them, deceiving everyone in the world.

Shannon: So what? That’s how it is. Who does not deceive other people? There’s nothing you can do about it.

Shelley: Don’t be upset, Shannon. I just get confused sometimes. For example, today, when the pianist asked me to play, I wished I could play something. But I was not confident enough.

Shannon: That’s why I took your place. And I played well, didn’t I?

Shelley: Yes, you did.

Shannon: Then what’s the problem?

Shelley: But then he must have thought that that’s how I play. But it’s your performance.

Shelley: I mean, what happens if we transfer from one to another without control during performance? I cannot anticipate when you appear and when not. Every time I see someone, I just don’t know what’s gonna happen. Maybe Mrs. McDowell’s right. Maybe we really can’t perform in public. It would just become a chaos, and he would really think I’m mad.

Shannon: Uh huh. You care what he thinks of you? That’s O.K. That’s natural. You are nearly twenty. You can have fun.

Shelley: Shannon, it’s not like that. I’m just... (Silence. After a while, she sees the music that Mr. STEVENS left. She opens the music. She turns the pages, and finds a song titled Tears. She reads a quoted poem for the song:)

"Human tears, O human tears!  
You flow both early and late -  
You flow unknown, you flow unseen  
Inexhaustible, innumerable, -  
You flow like torrents of rain  
In the depths of an autumn night.  
Tyutchev."

(She starts playing the song.)

Shannon: Stop it.

Shelley: (Alerted.) Shannon....

Shannon: I’m telling you to stop it.

Shelley: (Keeps playing.) Why, it’s beautiful....

Shannon: Just stop it! Otherwise, you know what I can do. (She begins to play Moonlight Sonata, mov.3 by Beethoven.)

Shelley: Shannon! This is what I mean. You just take over the place, whenever you feel like. What would happen if you behave like that on stage?

Shannon: Don’t talk to me like a parent!

Shelley: I’m sorry, Shannon. But what would happen, really? You know, if people laugh at me, they are laughing at you, too.

Shannon: Bull shit. Who would know if I’m playing or not? Or are you gonna ask to put two names on the programme?

Shelley: Shannon, why are you so upset about this?

Shannon: Can you just shut up when I’m playing? (After a while.) Shelley? Hello, is there Shelley, please? Just listen to this great cadenza.

A special comes on Mr. McDOWELL who has been overhearing her conversations behind the door.
Mr. McDowell: Fuck, she is a real loony.

He sneaks away. The special on him disappears.

SHANNON’s performance goes for a while. The light fades out when she finishes the piece.

SCENE THREE - Uncle versus Shannon/Shelley -

SCENE 3-1 ~ Tempest, mov.3 ~
(SHELLEY, Mr. McDOWELL, Mrs. McDOWELL)

The piano room. Lights come up. SHANNON is playing Tempest, mov.3 by Beethoven. Mr. McDOWELL comes in.

Mr. McDowell: (Opening the door.) Shelley! You haven’t changed yet. Why’s that?

Shannon: Why?

Mr. McDowell: Stop playing when I’m talking.

Shannon: I’m not feeling very well.

Mr. McDowell: Not feeling well? Get out. It’s Valerie’s birthday.

Shannon: Sounds great.

Mr. McDowell: What do you mean?

Mrs. McDowell’s Voice: Jez! Can you do up the fastener of my dress?

Mr. McDowell: I’m coming. (To SHELLEY.) Just get ready, all right? (Leaves.)

SHANNON goes to the door to shut and begins playing again. Mr. McDOWELL comes back.

Mr. McDowell: You are not ready, yet. All right. If you don’t wanna change, don’t change, then. Come on. Valerie’s waiting.

He grabs her arm to take her with him. SHANNON resists.

Mr. McDowell: What’s the matter?

Shannon: I don’t like her.

Mr. McDowell: That’s the problem. You don’t like anyone.
Shannon: I like my sister.

Mr. McDowell: You don’t have a sister.

Shannon: I heard you talking about me and my sister with your wife.

Mr. McDowell: Were you eavesdropping on us?

Shelley: You were eavesdropping on us, too.

Mr. McDowell: Us? You make me laugh. Your sister is dead. DEAD. Do you understand?

Shelley: Can’t you hear her?

Mr. McDowell: You can? That’s because you are bloody mad. Now I understand why they say, ‘Like begets like.’

SHELLEY does not seem to understand it.

Mr. McDowell: ‘Like father, like son.’

Shelley: Ah, ‘Kaeru no ko ha kaeru’.

Mr. McDowell: Huh?

Shelley: ‘A frog’s child is a frog.’

Mr. McDowell: What’s wrong with frogs?

Shelley: That’s how we say the phrase in Japan. Dad told me so.

Mr. McDowell: Oh, yeah. That’s the point. Your father was mad as a cut snake.

Shelley: Don’t call him names.

Mr. McDowell: He cannot hear it anyway. Or you’ll talk to him, too?

Shelley: Don’t. You know what’s the day today?

Mr. McDowell: I told you. It’s Valerie’s birthday.

Shelley: Why? Why no one remembers it? Every year, you all have fun in the party.

Mr. McDowell: What’s the matter? It’s a party.

Shelley: No one remembers that 14 years ago, when Valerie came over to Japan.... It was snowing. Snowing more than usual. But Dad had to go out to pick her up, and.... You know, if only Valerie....
Mrs. McDowell’s Voice: Jez, what are you doing?

Mr. McDowell: Hey, hurry up.

He pushes SHELLEY out of the room to make her dress up. While she changes, he tries to play some song on the piano with him singing.

SCENE 3-2
(SHELLEY, Mr. McDowell)

SHANNON comes in, dressed in an eccentric manner.

Shannon: Sounds horrible, man. (Grabs his face.) Sounds horrible.

Mr. McDowell: Hey, Shelley…. Are you really Shelley?

Shannon: Well?

Mr. McDowell: This is what you can really look like. (He takes her in front of the piano to show her mirror image.)

Shannon: And this is how I feel like.

She makes him touch her body.

Mr. McDowell: Shelley, what are you doing?

She closes her eyes. When she opens her eyes again, SHELLEY appears.

Shelley: What are you doing? No, no….

Shannon: She is saying ‘no’, all right?

Mr. McDowell: I didn’t do anything. You are really weird today, Shelley. You’d better stay home. Just stay home, all right?

Shannon: Are you scared of me?!

He turns his back to leave the room.

SCENE 3-3
(SHELLEY)

SHELLEY recovers her consciousness.

Shelley: Changed!

Shannon: You look really pretty, Shelley. I bet Jez was so impressed.
Shelley: Shannon, why do you put me in trouble like this?

Shannon: Me? Put you in trouble? Without me, you might not have been here now. Do you remember how many times you have attempted to commit suicide, and every time it didn’t work, did it?

Shelley: Was it you?

Shannon: Who else?

Shelley: How come you know everything about me and I don’t?

Shannon: It’s just that I’m a bit smarter than you.

Shelley: I believe you are.

Shannon: Aren’t you a sucker?

Fades out.

SCENE FOUR - Conflict -

SCENE 4-1 ~

*Barcarole, Revolution, Pathetique Sonata, mov.3 ~
(SHELLEY, Mr. STEVENS)*

The piano room. Lights come up.
SHELLEY is practicing *Barcarole* from Rachmaninoff’s *Fantasy.*
There is a knock at the door.

Mr. Stevens: Hello, Shelley.

Shelley: Hello, Mr. Stevens. How are you?

Mr. Stevens: Good, thank you. I heard you playing the piano duo piece.

Shelley: Yes, it is a beautiful piece. I can picture a barcarolle moving on the water.

Mr. Stevens: Lovely. Shall we begin from this tune, today?

SHELLEY nods at him and goes to the piano. Mr. STEVENS takes out his music and gets ready to play with her. They look at each other and begin playing. However, SHANNON starts playing a totally different music, *Revolution* by Chopin.

Mr. Stevens: (After a moment of a surprise.) Shelley?

SHANNON ignores it and keeps playing.
Mr. Stevens: Shelley!

Shannon: Yes.

Mr. Stevens: That sounds great. But I thought we were going to try the piano duo piece?

Shannon: Yes, of course.

Mr. Stevens: Yes? But you played something else.

Shannon: Oh, did I? I'm sorry. Do you wanna do it again?

They try it again. This time, she starts playing Pathetique Sonata, mov.3 by Beethoven, shortly after Mr. STEVENS began to play his part.

Mr. STEVENS goes to her piano and pats her on the shoulder.

Mr. Stevens: Shelley. Shelley!

SHANNON leaves the spot to SHELLEY.

Shelley: (Perplexed.) Yes. Did I do something wrong?

Mr. Stevens: Don't you know what you are doing?

Shelley: ....

Mr. Stevens: You don't like the idea of performing with me?

Shelley: I didn't mean.... Please let me try it again.

Mr. Stevens: All right.

They start playing Barcarole from Fantasy. After a short while, Mr. STEVENS stops playing.

Shelley: Yes?

Mr. Stevens: You are not listening to me, Shelley.

Shelley: I'm sorry.

Mr. Stevens: You don't have to be sorry. Let's just try it again.

They try again.

Mr. Stevens: See, Shelley. You are playing by yourself.

Shelley: .....
Mr. Stevens: This is not a piano solo, you see. You have to listen to your partner so well that it could even sound as if we were playing as one person.

Shelley: As if we were playing as one person....

Mr. Stevens: That's right.

Shelley: Do I have to be so close to you?

Mr. Stevens: Yes. I mean, in a way.

Shelley: No. I can't. I shouldn't.

Mr. Stevens: I don't mean....

Shelley: I'm sorry, Mr. Stevens, but I'm afraid I could not make it.

Mr. Stevens: Shelley?

Shelley: I'm sure you could find someone.... Could you just leave me alone. Please.

Mr. Stevens: I'll ring you, Shelley.

Mr. STEVENS leaves the room.

SCENE 4-2 ~ Suicide ~
(SHELLEY)

The lights fade slightly.
SHELLEY comes into the piano room with a knife in her hand. She tries to avoid seeing SHANNON in the mirror. SHANNON threatens her from the back in silence.

[Shannon: What are you doing?] (Only in SHELLEY's mind.)

[Shannon: What the hell are you doing?]

[Shannon: Are you kidding?]  

[Shannon: Stop it.]

Shelley: No.

[Shannon: Stop it! (She attempts to throw away her knife, but SHELLEY resists.)]

Shelley: No!! You cannot stop it this time. You know, you try to control everything I do to make sure that the world is revolving around you. And you do it really well. But you forget the fact that I have a soul, too. I start walking in some direction, and half way through, you make us go in another in your own direction. And you may think that you have your own way, but you don't, and neither do I. We are only drawing a zigzag line,
and we’ve lost in between the paths we have made. This being, this creature in here, it’s
neither you nor me. (Silence.) The heart beats. Feel the pulse, the flow of fresh blood.
It’s never been mine, and nor is it yours. I cannot bear this body any more.

[Shannon: Give it to me then. I don’t mind.]

Shelley: No! I’m not gonna give it to you!

[Shannon: Shelley, tell me how you are feeling about him.]

Shelley: What? What did you say?

Shannon: I think you’d like to bear his body.

Shelley: What do you mean?

Shannon: Come on. I know that you’ve fancied kissing him, everywhere.

Shelley: (Pause.) Shannon, do you know what it’s like? People go back to their room at
the end of a day, and they can take their clothes off; their masks, their protections. It’s
their own moments. Pure. Naked. Innocent. They can be as vulnerable as they want to
be. (She slowly begins to cover the mirror with a cloth.) And that’s why no one should
invade it. Including you, Shannon. (Pause.) This body belongs to me after all. You know
it well, don’t you? No one even knows that you, ‘Shannon Norton’ exists.

Shannon: Wait, Shelley. This is most unlike you.

Shelley: I seem to be learning a lot from you. (She finish covering the mirror.)

Fades out.

SCENE FIVE - The Past -

SCENE 5-1 ~ Shelley and Uncle ~
(SHELLEY, Mr. McDOWELL)

Dim Lights come up. The piano room. SHELLEY is lying in bed, staring at her wrist in
bandages. Mr. McDOWELL is staying aside.

Mr. McDowell: What happened, Shelley?

Shelley: I don’t know.

Mr. McDowell: You mean you don’t remember?

Shelley: I remember that I had thought about it, and then, I decided not to. But it seems
like I’ve done it after all.
Mr. McDowell: Was it because of Valerie?

Shelley: No.

Mr. McDowell: She was the one who found you. If it was a bit later, you could have been in danger. Has it to do with the pianist? If it’s too much pressure, you don’t have to do it, you know.

Shelley: No. There’s nothing wrong with it.

Mr. McDowell: Don’t tell me it was me. Believe me, I really didn’t mean....

Shelley: You didn’t do anything wrong, Jez. I know that.

Mr. McDowell: What was it then?

Shelley: ....I think I need some more sleep.

Mr. McDowell: O.K. But you can talk to me at any time, you know. Have a good sleep, Shelley.

Shelley: Thank you, Jez.

Mr. McDowell leaves the room.
Stage lights fade.

SCENE 5-2 ~ Scene of the Lost ~
(SHELLEY)

Blue coloured vague light.
SHELLEY is lying in bed.

Shelley: Shannon, why are we doing this? We used to share really well, didn’t we? (The blue light turns deeper. SHELLEY has a flashback of her childhood.) It’s very cold tonight.

Shannon: Ne, ‘Mikan no Uta’ shinai?

Shelley: ...?

Shannon: ‘Mikan no Uta’?

Shelley: Where are you?

Shannon: Kagami.

Shelley: Mirror? O.K. We can get comfy in bed. It’s very cold tonight. (She pulls the mirror stand to the bedside.)

Shannon: “Mikan no hana ga saiteiru
Omoide no michi oka no michi
Haruka ni mieru aoi umi
Kiteki ga 'boh' tto natteiru” (They play the game together with the song.)

The blue colour in the light fades away. The red colour comes up.

SCENE 5-3 ~ Nightmare ~
(SHELLEY, MOTHER, FATHER)

A red special comes on SHELLEY. MOTHER plays on the piano the part of lullaby from Chopin’s Scherzo No.1.

Shelley: Mum’s lullaby. No. It is different.... (Looks next to her.) Shannon?

FATHER appears.

Shelley: Dad. Dad....

He ignores her totally, which is unlike him. He looks at his wife.

Father: Yuri, which one of them shall we eliminate?

MOTHER keeps playing. FATHER turns back at SHELLEY.

Father: Shelley, which one of you shall we eliminate?

SHELLEY begins to shiver and shakes her head.

Father: Which one?!

Shelley: (Without voice.) No, no....

FATHER picks up a huge axe and approaches SHELLEY. At the last moment, she points at SHANNON in the mirror. He drops the axe on her. The light fades out. Sound of a mirror crash. SHELLEY screams. The music keeps going.

SCENE 5-4 ~ Sense of Guilty ~
(SHELLEY, Mr. McDowell, Mrs. McDowell)

The stage lights come up.
Mr. McDowell runs into the room.

Mr. McDowell: Shelley, are you all right?
Shelley: Dad.

Mr. McDowell: No, it’s Jez.
Shelley: Dad. Why did you....?
Mr. McDowell: Shelley, wake up! It's Jez!

Shelley: Where's Shannon?

Mr. McDowell: Shannon?

Shelley: Mirror, the mirror....

Mr. McDowell: Mirror? It's here, Shelley. Did you move it?

Mrs. McDowell is playing the same music on the piano.

Shelley: That music. It's not Mum. Stop it. Stop it!!

Mrs. McDowell hears it and stops playing.

Mrs. McDowell: What? Stop it? Fuck you then. (Leaves the room.)

Mr. McDowell: What was wrong with the music, Shelley? Valerie was playing it for you.

Shelley is shivering.

Mr. McDowell: What are you scared of?

Shelley: (After a pause.) Of myself.

Mr. McDowell: What do you mean?

Shelley: He asked me, he asked me which one to.... I killed her.

Mr. McDowell: Killed who?

Shelley: Shannon. We were playing together. She looked really pretty. And I wanted to survive as much as to kill her.... Look at this hand, fingers, arm, shoulder. These are all her remains. I pointed at her like this, with this finger, just like this.... (She points at Mr. McDowell.)

Mr. McDowell: Listen, Shelley. It wasn't your fault. She was physically much weaker than you, when she was born. That's why they....

Shelley: I pointed at her. I.....

Mr. McDowell: It's all right. It's all right. Have some more sleep, Shelley. I'll be here.

Fades out.
A couple of days later. Mr. STEVENS makes a visit to SHELLEY’s place. Mrs. McDOWELL comes at the door.

Mrs. McDowell: Hello, Andre.

Mr. Stevens: Hello. I wonder if I could see Shelley, please?

Mrs. McDowell: I’m afraid not. She’s been sick in bed for a while.

Mr. Stevens: Really? Is it serious?

Mrs. McDowell: She is getting better, but I’m afraid that your project might be putting too much pressure on her. She is a very sensitive girl, you see.

Mr. Stevens: I know, and it helps her music, Mrs. McDowell. Her music has something very strong in it. She should really pursue her music career. You said she hasn’t been to school, did you?

Mrs. McDowell: No, she hasn’t. She tried for a while, but had difficulty with her classmates and the school system.

Mr. Stevens: If it’s music school, she may get along. There is a scholarship system in my school, and I would be more than happy to recommend her for it.

Mrs. McDowell: That sounds wonderful, but I am not sure if she could....

Mr. Stevens: Mrs. McDowell, it is really a waste of talent if she just stayed at home as she does now. I think all she need is to learn to open herself up towards the outside world. I have seen many highly introvert people among musicians. But they understand each other well. They own a common language, you know. Could you talk about this with Shelley? She appeared a little negative about the concert on the other day, but she may feel encouraged to hear....

Mrs. McDowell: Well, she’s gone to bed, now. I’ll talk about it to her, tomorrow.

Mr. Stevens: Thank you, Mrs. McDowell. I’ll be in touch with you.

The special on Mr. STEVENS fades out.

The special on Mrs. McDOWELL fades, and dim lights come up. She goes to the piano room.
SCENE 6-2 ~ Valerie McDowell ~
(SHELLEY, Mrs. McDOWELL, Mr. McDOWELL)

The piano room. SHELLEY is sleeping. Mrs. McDowell comes in.

Mrs. McDowell: Shelley! Shelley!! (She grabs SHELLEY and shakes her.) You know what? That pianist just called me and said, you are bloody stupid. You understand nothing about music. Practise hard, O.K., do it. Do it as much as you want, and you get nowhere. Look at your little brother, he can play far better than you. (She laughs hysterically.) Your life is a failure, and I can correct it for you. (She attempts to strangle her.)

Mr. McDowell comes in, hearing her shouting.

Mr. McDowell: Valerie?! What the fuck are you doing?

Mrs. McDowell: It’s your fault. It’s your fault!

Mr. McDowell: Valerie!! (He drags her away from SHELLEY.) Don’t be stupid!

Mrs. McDowell: (She suddenly gives him her attention.) Stupid? Are you calling me stupid?? (Collapses.)

Mr. McDowell: Valerie....

Mrs. McDowell: Dad said I was such a stupid girl.

Mr. McDowell: No, Valerie, it wasn’t true. You are a very clever girl.

Mrs. McDowell: I practised so hard every day, but I couldn’t get in. I practised so hard, but it didn’t mean a thing to Dad, just because I couldn’t....

SHELLEY recovers from her fear, and gets out of her bed. She suggests by a gesture that Mr. McDowell let Mrs. McDowell rest in her bed.

Mr. McDowell: (Takes her to bed.) Come on, dear. Have some rest, O.K, and you’ll be all right.

Mrs. McDowell cries for a while, and falls into sleep.

SHELLEY finds a space to sit on the floor. Mr. McDowell comes up to sit next to her.

Mr. McDowell: Are you all right?

SHELLEY nods at him.

Mr. McDowell: Poor little girl. She didn’t mean that, you know.

SHELLEY nods in acknowledgement.
Mr. McDowell: I’ve seen her father only once. I had no idea.

Shelley: My Dad never called me stupid.

Mr. McDowell: I’m sorry that I called him that name the other day.

Shelley: ....

Mr. McDowell: To tell you the truth, I’ve seen him only once. It was at his wedding. I thought that I’d never seen such a happy man.

Shelley: Really? Do you think he was still happy even when he found that his babies were..., I mean....

Mr. McDowell: Don’t worry, Shelley. I’m sure he was. He sometimes wrote to us. I could tell that he loved you both so much, and he was really sad about what happened to your sister. Shelley, can you really hear your sister’s voice?

SHANNON appears.

Shannon: Jez, Jez.... Tell me your real name.

Mr. McDowell: My real name? You mean, Jeremy?

Shannon: Jeremy.... Would you call me, would you call me once, as ‘Shannon’?

Mr. McDowell: Shelley....

Shelley: Just once. Would you...?

Mr. McDowell: Shannon....

Shannon: I liked you, Jez.

SHANNON hugs him, and then disappears. SHELLEY finds her hugging Mr. McDOWELL.

Shelley: Again?!

Mr. McDowell: Shelley, ...I think I believe your story about Shannon.

Shelley: Jez.... Do you miss home sometimes?

Mr. McDowell: Yeah, I do at times. I have lived in this country for years, but I’ve never felt I belonged in it.

Shelley: As if you are just moving here and there on the surface like a floating weed.
Mr. McDowell: Yeah. There are many things to do here: I've got a job, I've made friends, I've got a wife. But I sometimes feel as if no one knows me, and wonder whether any one cares if I left this country. When I ask to use 'danny', they all crack up. But when I try to tell a gag, no one knows when to laugh. I want to be buried in Oz, when I die.

Shelley: I'd like to go home long before I leave this world.

Mr. McDowell: That's true. You can do that once you become independent.

Shelley: Independent?

Mr. McDowell: Yeah, once you begin to make your own living. Maybe as a pianist.

Shelley: I'm not confident.

Mr. McDowell: You should be. Do you know why Valerie is so upset about you? She is just jealous, because she cannot trust herself. She has to prove she is important by putting other people down.

Shelley: I think she is a very unhappy lady. Very....

Fades out.

SCENE SEVEN - Duet -

SCENE 7-1 ~ Tears ~
(SHELLEY, Mr. STEVENS)

The piano room. Lights come up.

Mr. Stevens: So have you made up your mind?

Shelley: Yes.

Mr. Stevens: And?

Shelley: I'd like to accept your offer.

Mr. Stevens: That's fantastic, Shelley. You'll learn a lot, Shelley. You'll learn not only solo piano, but also chamber music and piano concertos.... You can make friends, too.

Shelley: Friends?

Mr. Stevens: Yes. It's good to be around people of your own age, Shelley.

Shelley: Can we begin with the third movement, today?
Mr. Stevens: Yes. Sure.

SHELLEY and Mr. Stevens play *Tears* from *Fantasy* by Rachmaninoff.

Mr. Stevens: Great. It's great, Shelley.

Mr. STEVENS finds her holding her head.

Mr. Stevens: What's wrong?

Shelley: ....crying.

Mr. Stevens: Crying?

Shelley: She is crying. She wanted to play. She wanted to play with me.

**SCENE 7-2 ~ Revolution ~**

(SHELLEY)

The stage lights fade and special comes on her. She suddenly gets startled.

Shelley: No, wait, Shannon! Wait!!

SHELLEY joins in SHANNON’s playing *Revolution* by Chopin. SHELLEY finishes playing *Revolution* not as SHANNON, but as herself.

Shelley: (She looks up into her mirror image on the piano.)Shannon? (She goes to the mirror stand.) Shannon? (She looks for her into the sphere around her.) SHANNNNOOONNNNN?!!! (Silence.) Is this what you call loneliness? Is this what you are all bearing inside? Every one of you, and me. Me? Me!! (She looks at her hands as if she saw them at the first time.) My hands.... Was it me who played? Was it really me? My hands. My fingers. MY FINGERS!!! They are mine. They are mine. Mine. MINE!!

**SCENE 7-3 ~ Barcarole ~**

(SHELLEY, Mr. STEVENS)

SHELLEY goes to the piano resolutely, as the stage lights come up. She puts the music stand down.

SHELLEY and Mr. STEVENS play *Barcarole* from Rachmaninoff’s *Fantasy*.

They look at each other.
Fades out.

FINE