character - as it denies the distinction between character and actor".[61] Because film's ontology suits an exploration of types, it tends towards melodrama, and thereby urges us critically to reconceptualise what we understand to be depth of characterisation in film. Many American genre types spring to mind, but types are also integral to the finest European cinema. As Cavell says:

> I would find it hard to believe that anyone admires *Grand Illusion, Rules of the Game, Zero for Conduct* and *L'Atalante* more than I, but it seems to me more accurate to their intention and effect to say that they are explorations of types rather than explorations of characters...just think of the obvious surface of their content. The figures in both of the Renoir films are insistently labelled for us: the Aristocrat, the Jew, the Officer, the Professor, the Good Guy, the Poacher, the Wronged Wife, the Impetuous Lover. The shared subjects of the films depend upon this; both are about the arbitrariness and the [inevitability] of labels, and thence about the human need for society and the equal human need to escape it, and hence about human privacy and unknownness.[62]

We have seen how these last concepts are the subject of *Vertigo*, of Scottie's own theatricalisation. They also provide the sceptical melodrama of Greta Garbo and Bette Davis, who attempted to prove their own self-worth, their distinctiveness and freedom, by a theatricalisation of the self.[63]

* * *

The Willingness for the Everyday

The Awful Truth: Relatedness and Repetition

If so much of melodrama has, at its heart, the sceptical yearning (to desire something out of this world in order to connect with this world), and the ontology of film makes it a most suitable medium to entertain sceptical fantasies, then, according to Cavell, the genre of comedy, and especially the comedy of remarriage, maintains the sceptical link but becomes concerned with acknowledging and living with scepticism. To acknowledge and live with scepticism means not craving for something out of this world to satisfy our sense of the world, our touch with the world; instead, we must seek what is not out of the ordinary.

This is how Cavell defines the everyday - as against the human

yearning for things out of the ordinary. Quelling this yearning is crucial to his understanding of the everyday: we must embark on a quest to find fascination in the parts of the world we share (not parts we create privately), even though it is exactly those shared things that might appear boring because of their obviousness and repetition - indeed, because they occur each and every day. Cavell finds this dilemma to be at the heart of the comedies of remarriage where the couples have to learn to live with the repetitions of the everyday. In *The Awful Truth* (Leo McCarey, 1937, USA) - as in the other films of this genre[64] - the couple Jerry Warriner (Cary Grant) and Lucy Warriner (Irene Dunne) start married, and the "drive of its plot is not to get the central pair together, but to get them *back* together, together *again*".[65] Marriage is crucially connected to any discussion of the everyday because it entails the decision to live with one person every day of one's life. The result of this decision can be terribly disappointing, leading to all those dissatisfactions with the repetitions of the world which are the plight of scepticism: the desexualising (or deromanticising) of our relationships because of the routines of domestication, or our repelling of each other even when we mean to attract. So, although marriage is intended to be a ratification, it is, in fact, in need of constant ratification itself.

The final scene of the film is central to understanding the process of learning to live with another person each and every day. Jerry and Lucy have both ended up in a relative's house in Connecticut, where they have gone upstairs to sleep in adjacent rooms (FIGURE 2). At midnight, their divorce will become official. Luckily, they are only (physically) separated by a faulty door. When Jerry comes into Lucy's room, she says: "Well, I mean, if you didn't feel the way you feel, things wouldn't be the way they are, would they?". Jerry then replies, "But things are the way you made them", to which she retorts, "Oh no. They're the way you think I made them. I didn't make them that way at all. Things are just the same as they always were, only you're just the same, too, so I guess things will never be the same again." When the door opens for the third and last time later in the scene, this conversation is continued with more complicated plays on the words "same" and "different". When Jerry says "So, as long as I'm different, don't you think things could be the same again", he is finally understanding the idea, if they are to stay with each other every day, that he must scrutinise himself and his relation to Lucy for things to remain the *same*. This acceptance is animated through the manner in which he finally replies to her, the way that he has to face up to her words: in using her words to repent, he really starts to listen to her.

They learn to play with words together and become conscious of that play (indeed, knowingness about the use of words is a significant aspect to much comedy), and, for Cavell, this is crucial for their mutual attunement. Thus, *The Awful Truth* is centred around banter, Cavell seeing the witty and speedy dialogue as a mode of association and a form of life.[66] Indeed, if both learning to live with scepticism and learning to

overcome the threat to marriage (and, therefore, the threat to the everyday) entail acknowledging others (unlike Scottie), then part of this acknowledgment is learning to speak the same language. This does not require saying the same things; in fact, it might need the opposite, and this recognition is part of acknowledging the partner's separateness from you.

In his more general philosophy, Cavell sees the overcoming of scepticism as lying in the pursuit of ordinary language. As Fischer says:

> Cavell, following Wittgenstein and Thoreau, urges us to 'cleave to the everyday', that is, to bring words back, or home, to the language games in which they are ordinarily used. Bringing words back to our everyday use of them in turn means letting words live, or reattaching their meaning to the flow of language.[67]

We have seen how scepticism entails a dissatisfaction with words, with not being able to express ourselves, and that film has been an ideal medium within which the problems with personal expression can be played out. Crucially, instead of trying to find a language that would solve everything once and for all - the sceptic's "necessarily unsatisfiable" and "paralyzing" "craving for clarity"[68] - we should learn to determine our meaning in conversation, not once but everyday; our meaning should be found in *repeated* communication.

The only language we should desire is one rooted in day-to-day relatedness, with all the hesitations and insecurities that entails. Scepticism always shows a disappointment in daily life, wishing, as Fischer writes:

> [T]o arrive at some absolute foundation for our judgments, thereby stripping 'ourselves of the responsibility we have in meaning [or in failing to mean] one thing, or one way, rather than another'. From the skeptic's point of view, repetition smacks of failure.[69]

Thus, for Cavell, relatedness, language rooted in day-to-day conversation, is all about responsibility to others, and therefore it is not something to get over or resolve, but something to acknowledge and then thrive on. As Cavell argues: "The idea is less to defend our ordinary beliefs than to wean us from expressing our thoughts in ways that do not genuinely satisfy us, to stop forcing ourselves to say things that we cannot fully mean".[70] So many words in modern society are used in an empty way which is not the result of speaking meaninglessly, "but rather speaking pointlessly, as if we had nothing in mind, or *nothing at heart* to say".[71]

The use of the term "remarriage" registers the two most impressive affirmations of human experience for Cavell - the "acceptance of human relatedness" within an "acceptance of repetition".[72] Indeed, Jerry keeps returning to Lucy's room (three times), building into this final sequence an

acceptance of repetition. The scene conveys the sense that they must keep coming together, keep engaging in a dialogue. The decision to become married is not confirmed by a ceremony, but in a mode of repetition, and genuine communication is found in this repetition. The marriage ceremony may well be a festival, but true ratification of the marriage is provided from within the continuous festivity of the union itself. The festivity lies in the comic nature of repetition in this scene: fighting with the door, the wind, with silly bedclothes. The repetition here is understood as something festively comic.

The crucial aspect of the comedy of this scene, however, is that it does not provide a knockout climax for the film. As Mulhall says, the film offers a "contesting [of] the irregular outbreak of extraordinary comic events with a continuous line of unbroken comedic development, in order to suggest that the rhythmic recurrences of ordinary diurnal life provide fun and interest enough to inspire life and a commitment to its continuation".[73] The last shot of a human in the film (the very last shot is of the clock) shows Jerry looking puzzled while Lucy laughs offscreen: he is still bewildered and she still gently mocks him. There is no fade-out kiss, for example, with which to seal their happiness. This is because their happiness is not sealed; the slight indeterminacy in the ending, aptly encapsulated in Jerry's facial expression, signals that they must continue in this playful vein. The film rejects tight closure: while Jerry's bemused face implies that any commitment to married life will be without certainty, similarly Lucy's giggles are not the acceptance of a character having the *last* laugh, but of a continuing commitment to laughter.

With the end of the sureties provided by Christianity, and then the failure of a "redemptive politics" or "redemptive psychology", Cavell argues that there needs to be "a new burden of faith in the authority of one's everyday experience, one's experience of the everyday, of earth not of heaven".[74] Without society to provide continued affirmation, personal qualities will be needed, such as "wit, invention, good spirits, the capacity to entertain...since these are no longer to be had for the hiring".[75] If the style of melodrama is accounted for by its entertaining of sceptical fantasies, we might say that the witty and inventive style of comedy is partly elucidated by this redemptive pursuit of the everyday, both characters and audience trying to accept a life of the festive, by enjoying frustrating and embarrassing repetitions (maybe this is what we mean when we say that the comic helps us "get *through* life"; the comic moments prevent us from needing to avoid it).

We might recall Laurel and Hardy desperately trying to carry the music box up the huge flight of steps only to watch them watch it, time and time again, fall all the way back down to the street. Each time the piano descends, it is *another* fine mess, but the joy in these films is learning to accept the inevitability of life's repetitions; acknowledging that there is never any accounting for the slight variations that will be thrown up to complicate some mundane task. Laurel and Hardy's friendship and

behaviour at the truest and deepest level were never about stupidity: they were actually an extreme rendering of the inevitable need for, and yet the difficulties of, human relatedness in the middle of the desperate endeavour to stay devoted to the world of one's life. The fact was that Stan and Ollie always lived through the music boxes to sell Christmas trees; they always showed the willingness to carry on.[76]

The Festive Everyday

As for Stan and Ollie, so for Lucy and Jerry: "[t]heir lives are held together not by an event [for example, marriage] but by their attitude toward events - their capacity for adventure".[77] What does this attitude consist of? I want to emphasise how Cavell's conception of the everyday is one of eradicating the necessity of a notion of once-and-for-all events, but not one of disposing of events *per se*. Although the final scene of *The Awful Truth* does not provide one knockout finale, it does have a series of little dramatic events: significantly, it makes the ordinary eventful.

As Cavell's return to the everyday is constituted in the redemptive processes which undo scepticism, his conception of the everyday actually lies in a transformation of it. Nevertheless, the term is still pertinent.[78] Repetition is a significant aspect of the scene's organisation, with Jerry moving into Lucy's room on three occasions, and there are important concerns around the manner in which the repetitious structure is rendered. This is a matter of pacing: in one moment, Jerry is pushing to open the dividing door so that he can be with Lucy once more, while a canny black cat presses stubbornly against the door from Lucy's room. When the cat moves, the door rather smoothly sweeps aside; it does not crash or bang open. Jerry is caught on his knees, but the movement of the door allowing his disclosure has an easy flow, and it rhymes (and repeats) with a similar movement of the dividing door at the start of the scene when he was first revealed and displayed in the large pyjamas. The relative comic restraint here illustrates that, although the couple need to rediscover adventure in the domestic, it should be on adjusted terms. The pace of comedy illustrates that they need to find a deft playfulness within the repetitious rhythms of everyday life. This is reflected in the dialogue exchanges in this scene: their "banter" is not speedy or rushed; in fact, it is quite calmly and deliberately delivered, with both a delightfully considered and relaxed dexterity over the wordplay, and an almost serene compatibility in their tone, delivery and vocabulary. The indication is that their conversations might retain their mutual attunement but lose some of their fierceness. They could forgo intense occasions of pleasure, not search for wonderful bursts outside their day-to-day marriage (such as their extramarital affairs), and instead recognise that they must adjust to the easygoing festive possibilities of the everyday; they must feel the everyday once again, learn to go with it.[79]

Regardless of the easygoing tempo, however, there is still a festivity to be found in the moments of the everyday which characterise it as eventful, full of little events. These may not quite be events in the sense of crescendo happenings to which are attached a fairly definite importance (such as a wedding ceremony), but equally they are not felt to be only routine happenings. Indeed, these happenings are given festivity because the characters find and feel a sense of the event in areas where we might not imagine there to be such a sense. In this way, the various paraphernalia of ordinary existence are transformed to convert everyday life into a series of mini-events.

The clothes of the everynight become dramatic garments facilitating the transformation of the ordinary. As the dividing door glides open, Jerry is displayed in his too-big pyjamas and does a jig. The jig is a gesture to her, a certain acceptance of his ridiculousness, and a giving in to the playfulness of it - rather than becoming irate at the embarrassment. The film alerts us here to the role of the comic spirit in real life. Through accepting an ironising of ourselves, in allowing ourselves to become comic, we are able to laugh at our own (self-)doubts, rather than be consumed by them. How often are we so wrapped up in our own problems that we fail to find jokes funny? So much of the comic spirit then seems to have this intimate relationship with the everyday; this spirit consists of a mature interaction with the everyday so that we can live with it, inhabit it (not fly from it).

Lucy's nightie is old-fashioned, a huge cross strap wrapping over her chest and shoulders; it is full and heavy, covering most of her flesh. It is clearly signalled as being rather ordinary in a dowdy sort of way, but the ordinary here is so excessive that the nightie becomes grotesque. Thus, their clothes are not the routine clothes of every night, but are transformed into the costumes of their comic courting. Their costumes theatricalise them to a point where the ordinary has to be made more vivid; it is ridiculed so that it can be brought back to life.

The nightgown is depicted as particularly desexualising, and it is a suggestive comic irony that what is ordinary must become grotesquely without sexuality in order for it to rouse their sex life. Similarly, Lucy's manœuvres with the bedsheets invest them with the erotic (FIGURE 3). As she lies in bed, she clutches her blanket tightly up to her chin, ensuring that it acts as an armament in the battle of the sexes: it is not only a defence in its snug enclosure of her in a separate and private space, but also an invitation for Jerry to join her when he is up to it (so to speak). Her wriggles underneath the blanket act as a teasing taunt and an undisclosed promise, a suggestion of feisty sexuality - albeit under the covers. Her handling of the blanket shrouds her body (makes her bodiless), and hopefully will provoke the thrill of its rediscovery. A blanket thus becomes a piece of dramatic weaponry in her sexual come-on, central to the pursuit of igniting the domestic once again.

Similarly, a faulty door may be the most ordinary piece of décor imaginable; here, however, the door becomes the centre of their courting ritual, and its influential role in the scene's choreography converts it into something magical and divine. The door divides them and, because it keeps them awake, allows them to come back to one another: in Cavell's terms, we might say that it forces them to acknowledge their separateness in order that they may regain their intimacy. And, in acting as the strategic "window" that, on several aptly timed occasions, reveals Jerry in a compromising position, the door demands that he face exposure, rather than avoid letting himself be really known to her - that is genuinely understanding himself in relation to her.

The sense of magic is exacerbated by the camera's movement. In one moment, its pan across from open window to the door matches the direction of the gust of wind. There is a feeling here of being taken with the fantastic forces aiding the couple's regaining of intimacy. On two occasions, the camera pans up, in a movement not unlike that of rising cigarette smoke or a rising snake being charmed, to the clock with the dancing figurines. The wafting rise of the camera takes us to this enchanting clock, which behaves with a special affinity for the couple. The last shot of the film shows the figurine resembling Jerry following the little Lucy round into her hole instead of returning to his own, so at the moment that their divorce becomes official they have, in fact, started to remarry. There is something bewitching in the camera movement, setting up the clock as a teasing imagining, floating in a cartoon bubble above their heads. Time does not exist here as ordinary minutes but as something sublime, something with which they are now, comically yet appropriately, in tune.

The Undramatic Everyday

In Cavell's terms, Lucy and Jerry have regained a sense of their time together; their experience of this time is happy, fun, playfully comic. The everyday is recaptured by experiencing it as a series of little, but wonderful, events. Indeed, Cavell often follows Søren Kierkegaard in talking of the *sublime* in the everyday, or quotes Ralph Waldo Emerson describing the physiognomy of the ordinary:

> The meal in the firkin; the milk in the pan; the ballad in the street; the news of the boat; the glance of the eye; the form and the gait of the body.[80]

There is here, in the very syntax, in the oh-so-neat balance of the clauses and its excited jumps between the various ordinary things described, a desire to turn the ordinary into something dramatic or eventful in order to find touch with it. Is it then possible to search out what is fascinating in

the ordinary without romanticising it, without transforming it into something poetic, something dramatic, something full of magical events? Perhaps this is the surreptitious power of scepticism: that, even when we endeavour to regain touch with the world through showing a willingness to represent the everyday (rather than a yearning for something out of the ordinary), we still end up needing to romanticise it, to turn it into something else.

Cavell implies the possibilities elsewhere when he discusses that the study of history should also be "interested...in the *uneventful*, seeking, so to speak, what is not out of the ordinary. The uneventful, so conceived, is an interpretation of the everyday, the common, the low, the near".[81] Yet, this process requires learning to see "the near", fulfilling Emerson's wish for his readers to be wary about the significance they might attach to

> [T]he great, the remote, the romantic; what is doing in Italy or Arabia; what is Greek art, or Provencal minstrelsy...Give me insight into today, and you may have the antique and future worlds.[82]

What might this "insight into today" consist of? Cavell uses Edgar Allan Poe's story of "The Purloined Letter", where "[t]he narrative comes to turn on the fact that a purloined letter was hidden by being kept in plain view, as if a little too self-evident, a little too plain to notice".[83] Indeed, many detective stories have played on what is hidden in the apparently self-evident; it was one of the recurring organising principles of Arthur Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes' tales (when all else is exhausted, return to the investigation of the obvious).[84] Furthermore, Cavell notes that Martin Heidegger has written of *unconcealing* the obvious, and Cavell also finds this a recurrent theme in Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations* (1953):

> The aspects of things that are most important for us are hidden because of their simplicity and [ordinariness, everydayness]. (One is unable to notice something - because it is always before one's eyes.)[85]

Taking Wittgenstein and Heidegger as exceptions, Cavell sees most of philosophy as deliberately avoiding the everyday; after all, this is what philosophy's tussle with scepticism has ensured. Philosophy is so often trying to find words outside ordinary language to prove the existence of the world:

> It turns out to be something that the very impulse to philosophy, the impulse to take thought about our lives, inherently seeks to deny, as if what philosophy is dissatisfied by is inherently the everyday.[86]

Equally, I claim that, when *films* "take thought" about our lives, they too are dissatisfied with the everyday. Indeed, as a "moving image of scepticism", one would not be surprised that, even when film shows a willingness to represent the everyday, it starts taking those routes out of the ordinary.[87]

However, if, as Cavell discovered, a foundation of film is its ability to bring us so close to the world by recording it, it seems to be equally a possibility of the medium, indeed a unique possibility, that it could find interest in what is so apparent, find fascination with the ordinary without necessarily transforming it beyond recognition. Perkins has said in another context:

> The meanings I have discussed...are neither stated nor in any special sense implied. *They are filmed.* Whatever else that means...it means that they are not hidden in or behind the movie...*A process like story-making in transmitted images develops as a medium because artists explore its possibilities for 'making overt', which in large degree means its capacity to imply.* In other words, implication is a form of expression, not of concealment.[88]

I find this conceptualisation of cinema's mode of implication lying precisely in its forms of "making overt" absolutely suited to "unconcealing the obvious", of revealing what is important but hidden only because it is always - every day - before our eyes. Moreover, this would be fascinating in itself; there would be no requirement to fly into fantasy or to express oneself melodramatically so as to be seen and heard. I have found four exceptional films which genuinely *acknowledge* the everyday; they do not need to *avoid* it or transform it. I take these films to *disclose* the everyday, finding their fascination in it by way of Cavell's formulation for undoing scepticism-"repeatedly, unmelodramatically, uneventfully".[89] Furthermore, I take this study to be concerned with illuminating those disclosures and the manner of their disclosing, discovering in the process the possibilities both for cinema outside melodrama and for cinema to satisfy our cravings to reconnect with the world.

* * *

I have shown that Stanley Cavell's understanding of scepticism, the medium of film, the melodramatic and comic expression within the medium, and the repetitions of the everyday are intimately connected. The interconnections between these matters provide an important conceptual backbone to this book. Cavell's interest in the ordinary, however, is one

of turning it, in order to regain touch with it, into a site of festivity; in writers such as Emerson he has found the quest for the ordinary to be a romantic and eventful pursuit. This contrasts with an ordinary which is undramatic and uneventful. Acknowledging, therefore, that the everyday is a term amenable for use in varied contexts, the following chapter continues to refine my particular specification of the everyday by engaging with some significant films which might be claimed to be dealing with "ordinary life".

Notes

1 Stanley Cavell, *The World Viewed: Reflections on the Ontology of Film*, enlarged edition (Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1979): 188.

2 Ibid: 22.

3 As expressed by William Rothman, analysis of *The World Viewed* (unpublished).

4 Stanley Cavell, *The Senses of Walden*, expanded edition (San Francisco: North Point Press, 1981 [original edition 1972]): 145. Emphases in original.

5 Stanley Cavell, *In Quest of the Ordinary: Lines of Skepticism and Romanticism* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1988): 172.

6 Rothman.

7 Cavell (1988): 173.

8 Michael Fischer, *Stanley Cavell and Literary Skepticism* (Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 1989): 83.

9 Ibid: 85.

10 Stanley Cavell, *Must we mean what we say?: A Book of Essays* (Cambridge; London; New York; Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1976): 284 (quoted in Fischer: 83; emphasis in original).

11 Fischer: 87.

12 Cavell (1979): 86.

13 Ibid: 85.

14 Ibid.

15 V F Perkins, *Film as Film: Understanding and Judging Movies* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972): 154.

16 Stanley Cavell, "What Becomes of Things on Film?", in *Themes Out*

of School: Effects and Causes (San Francisco: North Point Press, 1984): 181. Emphasis in original.

17 Ibid: 180.

18 Furthermore, Scottie's obsession arises out of a mild boredom. One way of understanding the state of boredom is as an excess of imagination, and hence the failure to find sufficient stimulation in the ordinary aspects of life, those we also share with others. (For other, but related, expressions of boredom, see Chapter 5.)

19 Robin Wood, "Male Desire, Male Anxiety: The Essential Hitchcock", in Marshall Deutelbaum and Leland Poague (eds), *A Hitchcock Reader* (Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press, 1986): 227.

20 Cavell (1979): 86.

21 Ibid: 202.

22 Ibid.

23 Thomas M Leitch, *Find The Director and Other Hitchcock Games* (Athens, OH; London: The University of Georgia Press, 1991): 202.

24 These spiralling examples are drawn from Lesley Brill, *The Hitchcock Romance: Love and Irony in Hitchcock's Films* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988): 202-204.

25 Leitch: 202.

26 Ibid: 223.

27 I will discuss below how engaging in conversation and achieving equality of conversation constitute Cavell's central tasks for returning to a state of acknowledging others and rediscovering the stimulation provided by the everyday.

28 Cavell (1988): 154.

29 Cavell (1979): 180.

30 Thomas Elsaesser, "Tales of sound and fury: Observations on the Family Melodrama", *Monogram* 4 (1972): 2-15.

31 A phrase used in a different, but related, context by Stephen Mulhall, *Stanley Cavell: Philosophy's Recounting of the Ordinary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994): 238.

32 The nine films that Cavell takes to be the primary members of the genre are *Blonde Venus* (1932), *Stella Dallas* (1937), *Showboat* (1936), *Mildred Pierce* (1945), *Random Harvest* (1942), *Die Marquise von O/La Marquise d'O* (*The Marquise of O*, 1976), *Now, Voyager* (1942), *Gaslight* (1944) and *Letter From an Unknown Woman* (1948).

33 Cavell (1979): 206.

34 Mulhall: 244.

35 Stanley Cavell, "Ugly Duckling, Funny Butterfly: Bette Davis and *Now, Voyager*", *Critical Inquiry* 16 (winter 1990): 228 (also quoted in Mulhall: 244). Emphasis added.

36 Mulhall: 245. For a fresh deployment of the "unknown woman" concept, see Chapter 5.

37 Cavell (1979): 16-25.

38 Stanley Cavell, "What Photography Calls Thinking", *Raritan* 4 (1985): 4 (also referenced in Mulhall: 225).

39 Cavell (1979): 24. Emphases in original.

40 Ibid.

41 Ibid: 23.

42 Ibid: 24.

43 Ibid: 26.

44 Mulhall: 228.

45 Ibid. Emphasis added.

46 Cavell (1979): 21-23. Emphasis in original.

47 Ibid: 23.

48 Mulhall: 229.

49 Ibid.

50 Quotations and ideas here are from ibid. Emphasis in original.

51 Cavell (1979): 41.

52 Fischer: 96.

53 Cavell (1979): 41.

54 Cavell (1984): 180-181. Emphasis in original.

55 Perkins: 62. Indeed, Perkins' thesis on the cinema brought together the recording/realist aspects of the medium with its "creative" aspects, and claimed their *combination* to be the underpinning of the medium's distinctiveness.

56 Some of these categories are listed by Cavell (1979): 36.

[57] Narrative film tends to be more concentrated than the novel, so that film characters find themselves in more limited predicaments, which, in turn, circumscribe the range of possibilities for their development as characters.

[58] Marian Keane, "Dyer Straits: Theoretical Issues in Studies of Film Acting", *Post Script* 12: 2 (winter 1993): 36.

[59] Questions brought up by Keane: 31.

[60] Rothman.

[61] Ibid.

[62] Cavell (1979): 175-176.

[63] Furthermore, we can claim that the excesses of performance - this theatricalisation - also stem from the camera's insistent attentions. As Cavell says:

> Under examination by the camera, a human body becomes for its inhabitant a field of betrayal more than a ground of communication, and the camera's further power is manifested as it documents the individual's self conscious efforts to control the body each time it is conscious of the camera's attention to it. (Cavell [1985]: 14)

[64] The films in the genre consist of *The Lady Eve* (1941), *It Happened One Night* (1934), *Bringing Up Baby* (1938), *The Philadelphia Story* (1940), *His Girl Friday* (1940), *Adam's Rib* (1949) and *The Awful Truth*.

[65] Stanley Cavell, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Hollywood Comedy of Remarriage* (Cambridge, MA; London; Harvard University Press, 1981): 2. Emphases in original.

[66] Ibid: 152.

[67] Fischer: 130-131.

[68] Ibid: 131.

[69] Ibid: 130, including quotation from "Being Odd, Getting Even *(Descartes, Emerson, Poe)*", in Cavell (1988): 105-130.

[70] Stanley Cavell, "The Ordinary as the Uneventful (A Note on the *Annales* Historians)", in Cavell (1984): 192.

[71] Ibid: 191. Emphasis added.

[72] Cavell (1981): 241.

[73] Mulhall: 235.

[74] Cavell (1981): 240.

[75] Cavell (1979): 79.

[76] For an excellent dissection of the repetitions in Laurel and Hardy films, see Charles Barr, *Laurel & Hardy* (London: Studio Vista, 1967). Raymond Durgnat likens the structure of *The Music Box* (1932) to the myth of Sisyphus. See Raymond Durgnat, *Durgnat on Film* (London: Faber and Faber, 1976): 141. Yet, the crucial difference is that Sisyphus enacted his frustrating task all alone. For more on comedy, film and its relation to the repetitions of the everyday, see Chapter 5.

[77] Fischer: 88.

[78] Cavell does not, however, analyse this final scene in detail.

[79] For more on everyday conversation, see Chapter 4 and especially Chapter 7.

[80] Ralph Waldo Emerson, quoted in Cavell (1981): 14.

[81] Cavell (1984): 193. Emphasis in original.

[82] Emerson, quoted in Cavell (1981): 14.

[83] Cavell (1988): 164.

[84] I explore the detective story framework employed outside the detective story genre in Chapter 7.

[85] Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, point 129, quoted in Cavell (1988): 164.

[86] Cavell (1988): 170-171.

[87] See Chapter 2 for more detail.

[88] V F Perkins, "Must We Say What They Mean?: Film Criticism and Interpretation", *Movie* 34/35 (winter 1990): 4. Emphases added.

[89] Cavell (unpublished), describing how we might undo sceptical doubts, rather than answering them or submitting to them, quoted in Fischer: 131.