

THE UNIVERSITY OF HULL

**British Art Cinema 1975-2000:
Context and Practice.**

being a Thesis submitted for the Degree of PhD
in the University of Hull

by

Brian Hoyle
B.A. University of Hull

July 2006

Acknowledgements.

I would like to thank the following for their invaluable contributions, support and guidance. The Arts and Humanities Research Board, for generously funding my research into British art cinema for three years. The British Film Institute library for access to unpublished archive material pertaining to the work of Chris Petit, Terence Davies, Sally Potter and Andrew Kötting, and to the staff in their screening-rooms for allowing me the opportunity to view countless films.

Professor Gabriele Griffin for her dedicated supervision, input and knowledge of the doctoral process, as well as for her patience. Rowlie Wymer for his guidance and supervision and for kindly sharing his thoughts and research on Derek Jarman and many other facets of British cinema.

Rachel Hayward, Cinema Education Officer and Linda Pariser, Cinemas Director at the Cornerhouse cinema in Manchester, for their assistance in finding screening and distribution information about many British art films, as well as their generous donation of related unpublished press material. The staff at Hull Screen, the Organisers of the International Short Film Festival and Laurence Boyce at 'The Leeds Guide' for keeping me informed of developments in contemporary British art cinema.

Dr. Lesley Coote at Hull University and the Medieval Institute at the University of West Michigan, Kalamazoo, for giving me the opportunity to present material related to this thesis at local and international university conferences. Dr John Hoyles, Dr Bruce Woodcock, Dr Melanie Williams and Richard Cape at Hull University for their opinions, criticism and guidance of my research over the last years.

Finally, thanks to Claire at Caiman USA for help with locating copies of a large number of British art films currently unavailable in Britain. Martyn Colebrook at the Hull University Alumni Department Relations for his assistance in locating a few particularly obscure references. Timothy Palmer and William James for their invaluable assistance with all matters pertaining to information technology and internet research. Ruth at the Hull University English Department and the staff of the Graduate Research Institute for their invaluable help in all administrative matters. The library staff at SUNY New Paltz and Vassar College, New York and the Duncan of Jordanstone Library, Dundee.

Thanks also to my colleagues, Dr Jodi-Anne George, Dr Chris Murray, Dr Andrew Roberts, Dr Aliko Varvogli, Dr Keith Williams and Rob Watt at the University of Dundee English Department.

Finally, to Albert and Tammy for their love, patience and support. To Robert Caroline and Ali. And to my new nephew, Calvin, and Jo, with love.

Contents.

Introduction	1
Chapter One: Art Cinema in Britain Before 1975	38
Chapter Two: Attitudes Towards Realism in British Art Cinema	109
Chapter Three: Narrative in British Art Cinema	145
Chapter Four: Avant-Garde Filmmaking and British Art Cinema	179
Chapter Five: The Influence of Hollywood and European Art Films on British Art Cinema	216
Conclusion	251
Bibliography	256

Introduction.

Historically, British art cinema has been overlooked in its own country and has lacked the consistency of output, recurrence of theme and extended sense of experimentation that characterises art cinema in Europe. Indeed, one could go so far as to suggest that there has been no real tradition of making art films in British cinema.¹ This thesis argues however, that in the late 1970s and 1980s, filmmakers such as Derek Jarman, Peter Greenaway, Ken Loach, Mike Leigh, Chris Petit, Bill Douglas, Sally Potter and Neil Jordan², despite the differences between them, 'made up [...] a fully fledged auteur-based art cinema for the first time in the history of British cinema' (Rees, 1999: 98).³

While the existence of an art cinema in a European country such as France, for example, is rarely - if ever - contested, such claims cannot be made so nonchalantly about Britain. Indeed, British cinema in general is a famously neglected subject for critical commentary, often dismissed, perhaps by virtue of its shared language, as a poor relation of Hollywood. The American critic, Gerald Mast, for example, reserves a mere six pages for British cinema in *A Short History of the Movies*, one-fifth of the space dedicated to D.W. Griffith alone. However, Mast is not the only critic perpetuating this bias, as even British critics would seem implicitly to concur with François Truffaut's famous claim that there is a certain incompatibility between the

¹ See Alan Lovell (1969: 2); Derek Jarman (1984: 234); Peter Wollen (1993: 35-51) and John Hill (2000 (a): 18-28).

² Although technically from the Republic of Ireland, Jordan's early works, *Angel* (1982), *The Company of Wolves* (1984) and *Mona Lisa* (1986) were funded and distributed largely by British sources and operate within the confines of British art cinema. See Farley (2002: 186-193) and Rockett and Rockett (2003: 17-86).

³ While Rees' quotation refers specifically to Jarman and Greenaway, part of the argument of this thesis will be that other British filmmakers, such as Loach, Leigh, Davies and Potter, also produce work that can be seen as art cinema. As John Hill suggests, during the 1980s, the 'category of art cinema is not, of course, a precise one and [should be] used [...] in a relatively generous sense' (1997: 246) and include the work of filmmakers as diverse as Loach, Jarman and Potter. See also Higson (1998: 504).

terms 'cinema' and 'Britain' (Truffaut, 1969: 100). Indeed, most 'British critics who penned influential books or essays usually drew upon American rather than British films [...] to support their theories' (Friedman, 1993: 4)⁴.

However, with the revival of the British art film in the early 1980s, and the increased international profile of many of its key filmmakers, came a rise in the amount of critical attention paid to recent British cinema.⁵ British filmmakers such as Greenaway and Jarman, viewed by many as the central figures of British art cinema,⁶ and Loach and Leigh, who perhaps represent a more typically British style of realist filmmaking, yet whose work, despite their protestations,⁷ bears many of the hallmarks of art cinema,⁸ have been of particular interest to critics, with several book-length studies published on each since the start of the 1990.⁹ However, there has not as yet

⁴ Peter Wollen, for example, in his influential *Signs and Meanings in Cinema*, focused largely on the work of filmmakers such as John Ford and Howard Hawks. See Wollen (1973) and (1999: 499-512). See also Erik Hedling (2003: 25-6).

⁵ Notable full-length studies include: *British Cinema History* (James Curran and Vincent Porter eds., 1983); *Learning to Dream* (James Park, 1984); *On Cinema* (Porter, 1985); *National Heroes* (Alexander Walker, 1985 (a)); *The Once and Future Film: British Cinema in the Seventies and Eighties* (John Walker, 1985 (b)); *British Cinema Now* (Martin Auty and Chris Roddick eds., 1985); *British Cinema: The Lights that Failed* (James Park, 1990); *Take Ten: Contemporary British Filmmakers* (Jonathan Hacker and David Price, 1991); *Creativity and Constraint in the British Film Industry* (Duncan Petrie, 1991); *New Questions of British Cinema* (Petrie ed., 1992); *Fires Were Started: British Cinema and Thatcherism* (Lester Friedman ed., 1993); *The British Cinema Book* (Robert Murphy ed., 1997); *British Cinema in the 1980s* (John Hill, 1999); *British Cinema in the 1990s* (Robert Murphy ed., 2000) and *Icons in the Fire* (Walker, 2004).

⁶ See for example, Wollen (1993: 35-51); O'Pray (1996 (c): 178-190) and Hill (2000 (a): 18-20).

⁷ In a recent interview in *Sight and Sound*, Leigh commented that 'I'm not concerned to make films that are consigned to art house obscurity; in fact, I get very pissed off when people talk about my films as art house' (Lawrenson, 2005: 15). Loach has made remarks along similar lines, (see Fuller, 1998: 64). However, as Higson has noted, filmmakers such as Loach and Leigh are 'treated as auteurs' (1998: 504) by a large number of critics and both have received a great deal of acclaim at international film festivals, 'where [a film's] status as 'Art' is confirmed and re-stated through the existence of prizes and awards' (Neale, 2002: 118). For example, Leigh won the Palm D'Or at Cannes for *Secrets and Lies* (2005), as did Loach more recently for *The Wind that Shakes the Barley* (2006).

⁸ See Hill (1997: 247).

⁹ Greenaway has been the subject of *Being Naked, Playing Dead* (Alan Woods, 1997); *Peter Greenaway* (David Pascoe, 1998); *Peter Greenaway Interviews* (Vernon and Marguerite Gras, 2000) *Peter Greenaway's Postmodern/Poststructuralist Cinema* (Paula Willoquet-Maricondi and Mary Alemany-Galway, 2001). Jarman is the focus of *Derek Jarman: A Portrait* (Roger Wollen ed., 1996); *By Angels Driven: The Films of Derek Jarman* (Chris Lipard ed., 1996); *Derek Jarman: Dreams of England* (Michael O'Pray, 1996), a biography *Derek Jarman* (Tony Peake, 1999) and *The Films of Derek Jarman* (Rowlie Wymer, 2005); Mike Leigh is the subject of *The World According to Mike Leigh* (Michael Convey, 1997). *Mike Leigh Interviews* (Howie Movshovitz ed., 2000) and *The Cinema*

been a full-length study dedicated to contemporary British art cinema as a specific phenomenon. Rather, critical examinations of British art films have tended to appear in works arguing the case for a British national cinema in general, which often attempt to find a continuity and distinctive national voice in films ranging from the art films of Jarman and Greenaway, the heritage films of Merchant-Ivory, the larger-scale Hollywood-style films from Goldcrest, to smaller-scale television films made by the likes of Channel Four.¹⁰

Some examples, such as *A Night at the Pictures: Ten Decades of the British Film* (Adair and Roddick, 1985)¹¹ were perhaps rather premature celebrations of the so-called ‘renaissance’ in British cinema that seemed to agree with David Puttnam that success in America, such as that of *Chariots of Fire* (1981) and *Gandhi* (1982) at the ‘Oscars’ in 1982 and 1983 successively, was the ultimate vindication of the quality of British films.¹² Other commentators on the British film boom of the 1980s were more sober. James Park, for example, notes that ‘[i]n the enthusiastic search for a “renaissance”, many films of the period were overpraised, despite the fact that they made no advances in cinematic style or treatment of the subject matter. Critics, excited at having something home-grown to write about, often failed to identify the

of Mike Leigh: A Sense of the Real (Garry Watson, 2004). Several books have also been written about Ken Loach including *Agent of Challenge and Defiance: The Films of Ken Loach* (George McKnight ed., 1997), *Loach on Loach* (Graham Fuller ed., 1998) *The Cinema of Ken Loach: Art in the Service of the People* (Jacob Leigh, 2002) and *Which Side Are You On? Ken Loach and his Films* (Anthony Hayward, 2004).

¹⁰ Notable articles largely dedicated to contemporary British art cinema include: Steve Neale’s ‘Art Cinema and the Question of Independent Film’ in (Stoneman and Thompson eds., 1981: 41-5); Wollen’s ‘The Last New Wave’ in (Friedman ed., 1993: 33-51), O’Pray’s ‘The British Avant-Garde and Art Cinema from the 1970s to 1990s’ in (Higson ed., 1993: 178-90); Christopher Williams’ ‘The Social Art Cinema: a Movement in the History of British Film and Television Culture’ in (Williams ed., 1996: 190-200) and Hill’s ‘The Rise and Fall of British Art Cinema: A Short History of the 1980s and 1990s’ (2000 (a): 18-32).

¹¹ The book was ‘the official British Film Year publication’ (see Petrie, 1992: 1-2).

¹² *Chariots of Fire* won four ‘Oscars’, in the Best Picture, Best Screenplay, Best Music and Best Costume Design categories. *Gandhi* won a total of eight ‘Oscars’ including Best Picture, Best Director (Attenborough), Best Actor (Ben Kingsley), Best Screenplay, Best Cinematography, Best Art Direction, Best Costume Design and Best Editing. See Holden (1993).

defects of British films' (Park, 1984: 14).¹³

British art cinema, as a distinct entity, has often gone unrecognised and unappreciated in its native country. In the early 1980s, Jarman noted that 'the cinema I love hardly exists in this country, and where it exists it is fragmented and discontinuous [and] largely ignored by the mainstream' (Jarman, 1984: 234). This can be seen in Stephen Frears' British Film Institute-commissioned personal history of British cinema, *Typically British* (1997), which chooses to ignore British art cinema almost altogether, and represents Greenaway, Jarman, Davies, Potter, Douglas and Leigh by stills of one film poster each in the film's closing minutes. Another Hollywood-based British filmmaker, Alan Parker, the current head of Britain's main film funding body, The Film Council, has frequently spoken out against the British Film Institute and Film Four, the two bodies most responsible for supporting contemporary British art cinema¹⁴ stating that the former 'represents the visually impaired, élitist and kill-joy cinema of the intellectuals' (McLoone, 1996: 77)¹⁵ and the latter has a tendency to support films with an aesthetic more suited to television than to the cinema, 'with a consequence that most contemporary British films have admirable depth but no cinematic width' (McLoone, 1996: 78). Whilst the films of Jarman and Greenaway may lack the epic sweep and obvious commercial viability favoured by Parker,¹⁶ one cannot dismiss their work as either 'visually impaired' or as mere teleplays. Rather, their films feature an aesthetic that is at once painterly and cinematic,¹⁷ combining a unique visual style with the sense of movement implied by

¹³ See also Petrie (1992: 1-3).

¹⁴ See Pym (1993) and Hill (2000 (a): 19-22).

¹⁵ Parker famously stated that if Greenaway made another film in England he would leave the country with his children. See Hacker and Price. (1991: 189) and Walker (1993: 112).

¹⁶ In *Typically British*, Parker admits to an admiration of such Hollywood-backed British epics as David Lean's *Lawrence of Arabia* (1962).

¹⁷ Both Jarman and Greenaway initially trained as painters, and constantly attempt to bring 'the

the very term 'movie', to create compositions that are dwarfed on the television screen.

British art films have come under attack not only from the commercial side of British cinema, but also from those dedicated to the British tradition of social commentary in film and television. They find little social or political value in highly personal and somewhat obscure anti-Thatcherite allegories such as Jarman's *The Last of England* (1987) and Greenaway's *The Cook, The Thief, His Wife and Her Lover* (1989).¹⁸ Rather, critics who favour a socially committed British cinema are drawn to the earlier television works of filmmakers such as Ken Loach or even Mike Leigh, and have argued that 'the gain of a British art cinema may be at the expense of something quite valuable and immediate in a national television system' (Caughie, 2000: 198). Caughie further notes that

a very fundamental shift in national representations has occurred between Ken Loach's *Cathy Come Home* (1966) and *Ladybird, Ladybird* (1994) [in that] the social anger of *Ladybird, Ladybird* circulates within an aesthetic and cultural sphere which is given prestige (and economic viability) by international critics' awards, whereas *Cathy Come Home* circulated as a national event and functioned as documentary evidence within the political sphere (Caughie, 2000: 198).

Loach himself bears Caughie out, stating that in the 1980s he 'wanted to try to make a

aesthetics of painting to the cinema' (Ranvaud, 2000: 48). See also (Walker, 1993: 58-69; 112-130); O'Pray (1996 (d): 65-76) and Peake (1999: 69-118).

¹⁸ For examinations of the Anti-Thatcherite content of *The Last of England* see Jarman (1987: 189-248) and Hill (1999: 153-61). For similar writings about *The Cook, The Thief, His Wife and Her Lover* and other Greenaway films see Walsh (1993: 260-72), Hill (1999: 162-165), Jones (2000: 188-9) and

contribution, however minimal, to the political struggle that was going on [and] with that in mind, the idea of making a feature film which took three years to finance and another year to come out and then got shown in an art house to ten people and a dog just seemed a crazy thing for me to be doing' (Fuller, 1998: 64). Similarly, upon the release of Mike Leigh's *Naked* (1993), Andy Medhurst commented that the director 'is likely to be applauded for breaking away from his reputation for small scale, nuanced, domestic English tragicomedies [...] but I do worry that *Naked* might give him an open passport to the European art cinema [as] British social comedy is far more important' (1993: 11). British art cinema exists then in a kind of critical limbo in its own country and is often regarded by both the commercially and socially oriented factions of British filmmaking as difficult, obscure and elitist.

In his work on Scottish cinema, Duncan Petrie writes that some 'commentators have suggested that the reinvigoration and rebranding of British cinema in the 1980s has served to consolidate the idea of a distinctive British art cinema' (Petrie, 2000: 148). Petrie, however, recalls Godard's remark that 'there have been very few national cinemas', stating that it offers 'a useful caution to any claim that this somehow constituted the emergence of a new national cinema in Scotland' (Petrie, 2000: 148) and indeed Great Britain as a whole, as the term 'national cinema', *inter alia*, implies both a significant and consistent level of production and the sharing of certain themes amongst these films, that are relevant to an individual nation's culture and history. Between 1980 and 1993, Britain on average produced 42 films a year, excluding international co-productions - less than half those of France, Germany and Italy (Caughie, 1996: 196). Thus, in terms of its output, British cinema in the 1980s was not so much a renaissance, as 'a brief revival of production' (Friedman,

1993: 10) that hardly constitutes its advent as a major national cinema. Art cinema however, must be cast as distinct from 'national cinema', and it is possible for a country to lack a national cinema in the manner suggested by Godard and Petrie, but to have an art cinema. For example, a country such as Sweden may lack the level of production necessary to constitute a national cinema,¹⁹ but it does however, have a clear tradition of art cinema, operating outside of the mainstream, as typified by the work of Victor Sjöström, Ingmar Bergman, Vilgot Sjöman and more recently, Bille August and Lukas Moodysson.

The premature demise of the so-called British film 'renaissance' of the early 1980s, after the financial failure of multi-million pound films such as Hugh Hudson's *Revolution* (1985), Roland Joffé's *The Mission* and Julien Temple's *Absolute Beginners* (both 1986) left Jake Eberts' and David Puttnam's 'Goldcrest' and the fledgling 'Virgin' film production companies bankrupt and the mainstream of British cinema in disarray.²⁰ However, the far more modestly budgeted British art films of the time, which operated outside of the mainstream and found financial support from government-subsidised producers such as the British Film Institute and television companies, such as the newly founded Channel Four, remained largely unaffected. Therefore, for a time, in the mid 1980s to early 1990s, British art filmmakers such as Jarman, Greenaway, Leigh and Jordan, and the work of independent filmmakers such as Stephen Frears,²¹ dominated the British film industry.²²

¹⁹ For production details and figures see Caughie (1996: 196).

²⁰ See Eberts and Ilott (1990: 346-67; 444-542) and Walker (2004: 27-37).

²¹ See Hacker and Price (1991: 147-184); Friedman and Stewart (1994 (b): 221-240); O'Neil (1994); and Quart (1994: 241-248).

²² John Orr, has noted that the British renaissance of the 1980s 'had no central core or manifesto, no common theme linking its disparate parts' (Orr, 2000: 21). Many British art films of the 1980s however, despite clear stylistic differences, can be linked by their strong reaction to the policies and effects of Thatcherism. As Friedman has noted, 'British films of this period could not help being political (in the broadest sense of the word), as they charted the inexorably downward spiral of their homeland' (1993: 10). See also Hill (1999: 3-30; 133-65).

Before the late 1970s and early 1980s, examples of European-style art films were rare in Britain, perhaps present only in the work of a few filmmakers such as Joseph Losey,²³ Lindsay Anderson²⁴ Ken Russell²⁵ and Nicolas Roeg²⁶, and singular films such as Michael Powell's *Peeping Tom* (1959).²⁷ However, during the final quarter of the twentieth century, there were more than just a few isolated examples of filmmakers in Britain producing films that equate to the European model of art cinema, and art films were a prevalent enough feature of the British film industry and distinctive enough in their identity to justify claims that Britain fostered a significant and fully developed art cinema in the tradition of countries such as France, Germany and Italy. Indeed, as John Hill has noted, the work of filmmakers such as Jarman, Greenaway, Davies, Potter, Loach and Leigh in recent decades have made it 'much easier to identify a recognisably British art cinema and see it as a significant strand of British and, indeed, European filmmaking' (Hill, 2000 (a): 18).

What is Art Cinema?

Popular perception has perhaps come to view an art film as simply, '[a]ny film shown in art houses [...] for serious audiences, including small-budget but artistic foreign films, avant-garde films, and older classics' (Konigsberg, 1988: 18).

However, while the art cinema should indeed be seen as 'an institution', dependent

²³ See Caute (1994) and Sinyard (2003: 111-124).

²⁴ See Hacker and Price (1991: 25-63); Hedling (1997: 178-186); (1998) and (2003: 23-30) and Sinker (2004).

²⁵ See Baxter (1973); Gomez (1976); Walker (1985 (b): 95-105); Jarman (1984: 94-112); Russell (1993) and Caughie and Rockett (1996: 141).

²⁶ See Walker (1985 (b): 95-105); Lanza (1989); Hacker and Price (1991: 345-78); Sinyard (1991) and Caughie and Rockett (1996: 140).

²⁷ See Christie (1978: 53-8); Powell (1986) and (1990); Russell (1993: 100-109) and Lowenstein (2000: 221-232).

upon specific 'modes and circuits of production, distribution and exhibition' as well as 'relationships with the state' (Neale, 1981: 42),²⁸ merely '[i]dentifying a mode of production/consumption does not exhaustively characterise the art cinema, since the art cinema also consists of formal traits and viewing conventions' (Bordwell, 2002: 95) which separate it from both classical narrative cinema and the avant-garde.²⁹

Bordwell here implies that art cinema can be viewed as a kind of film genre.³⁰ 'To say this, however, is to invite the criticism that the creators of such films are too inherently different to be lumped together' (Bordwell, 2002: 95) and where the great film genres, such as the western, contain a large number of tropes and traits that make them instantly classifiable by a viewer,³¹ one would be hard pressed to find any obvious generic similarities between say, Godard's *A Bout de Souffle* (1959) and Fellini's *8½* (1963). Faced with this lack of familiar plots, character types, settings, techniques, and themes typical of more obviously generic film forms, Bordwell nevertheless argues that in art films, despite the variety of concerns unique to individual nations and cultures and the highly individual nature of their filmmakers, 'the overall *functions* of style and theme remain remarkably constant [...] as a whole [and] we can usefully consider the "art cinema" as a distinct mode of film practice, [with] a set of formal conventions, and implicit viewing procedures' (Bordwell, 2002: 94-5). In order to establish generic criteria to identify a certain film as an art film, then, one must look beyond the conventional notions of genre that operate on the surface of a film - horses, six-shooters and the like - and instead look to the manner of the film's construction in terms of style, narrative, structure and themes.

²⁸ See also Hill (2000 (a): 18).

²⁹ See Bordwell (2002: 94) and Hill (2000 (a): 23).

Art cinema represents a distinct form of cinematic practice, and can be identified by a number of stylistic, structural and narrative conventions and underlying themes.³² Perhaps most importantly, art films define themselves explicitly against the model of dominant mainstream filmmaking - as typified by Hollywood - in several ways. Firstly, as Mast notes, art films are rarely faithful adaptations of novels or plays,³³ but rather emphasise cinematic qualities over literary ones and define themselves in terms of directorial authorship,³⁴ or *auteurism*.³⁵ Secondly, art films tend to be structured around psychological problems and intellectual themes rather

³⁰ See Siska (1980) and Hill (2000: 23).

³¹ See Schatz (1981) and Neale (2000).

³² See Siska (1980), Mast (1985: 280-85) Bordwell (2002: 94-102) and Neale (2002: 103-120).

³³ While any survey of the films of European art cinema will reveal a large number of films based on novels and plays, and indeed, several notable European filmmakers including Carl Theodore Dreyer, Robert Bresson, Luchino Visconti and Pier Paolo Pasolini, build their careers largely on literary adaptations, Mast's assertion rather seeks to illustrate the unusual amount of original screenplays produced in European art cinema as compared to Hollywood and also to highlight the fact that many literary adaptations in European art cinema, such as Truffaut's *Shoot the Piano Player* (1960) and Godard's *Bandé à Part* (1964) and *Pierrot le fou* (1965) were adaptations of pulp novels, not literary classics, and were playful and loose adaptations of their literary sources.

³⁴ Art cinema has become dominated by 'an ideology of art as individual expression' (Neale, 1981: 44) and there is 'a notion that the art-film director has a creative freedom denied to her/his Hollywood counterpart' (2002: 97) hence, as Neale notes 'the overwhelming association of Art Cinema as a whole with a set of individual names: Antonioni, Bergman, Bertolucci, Bresson, Bunuel, Chabrol, Dreyer, Fassbinder, Fellini, Herzog, Truffaut, Visconti, Wenders, etc.' (1981: 44).

³⁵ A controversial 'type of film criticism that sees the director as the controlling force in a film, as an artist who infuses the entire work with his or her personality and point of view and all of whose films can be related in terms of similar techniques, styles and themes' (Konigsberg, 1988: 21). Conceived by Truffaut in his article 'A Certain Tendency in French Cinema' (1954) as 'a polemical weapon for a given time and a given place' (Sarris, 1999: 515), the term was designed to liberate filmmaking and film criticism from the overbearing influence of literature and its perceived superiority over the younger art. In his essay, Truffaut's main point of contention was a 'certain tendency' in French cinema to produce painstakingly faithful and reverent adaptations of great novels, a practice he ironically dubbed *le cinema du qualité*. He argued that such films, which derived most of their artistic merit from their famous source novels, were both culturally snobbish and counter-productive to the growth of cinema as an art form in its own right. Truffaut, and his fellow critics who were later to form the *nouvelle vague*, argued for *la politique des auteurs*, championing those filmmakers they saw as not valuing literary qualities over cinematic ones. The increased emphasis on the director as the controlling creative force of a film was not, as some critics of the theory have suggested, an attempt to deny film's status as a collaborative art - a claim not even the staunchest of *auteurists* would even consider making - but rather to create a kind of critical short-hand, which by emphasising the role of the director, could begin to enable one to discuss the making of a film in the way one would a painting, play or novel, with the director as the sole creator. There is however, a notable contradiction between the tendency for art cinema to define itself both in terms of *auteurism* and against Hollywood, as many of the original filmmakers put forward as *auteurs* by Truffaut et al, were Hollywood filmmakers such as Ford and Hitchcock. See Bordwell (2002: 100). See also Sarris (1999: 510); Goldman (1988: 99-104); Davies (1993: iii); Smith (2000: 100); Bordwell (2002: 97-9) and Hedling (2003: 23-34).

than conventional Hollywood stories.³⁶ Thirdly, while Hollywood apes the style of nineteenth-century novels,³⁷ with linear narratives, goal-oriented characters and clear resolutions, art films define themselves as cinematic equivalents of the modernist novels of writers such as Franz Kafka, James Joyce, Marcel Proust and Samuel Beckett,³⁸ with less clearly defined characters, episodic, fragmented narratives and ambiguous, often unresolved endings.³⁹ Fourth, European directors understood that a rejection of the narratives of Hollywood cinema equally required a rejection of its techniques, and new ones had to be found to complement their new modernist concerns (Mast, 1985: 281).⁴⁰ Finally, according to Bordwell, art cinema ‘defines itself as a realistic cinema’ (2002: 95). This realism is at once ‘objective’ in that art films such as *Bicycle Thieves* and *A Bout de Souffle* show ‘real locations’ (2002: 95) and ‘subjective’ in the sense that films such as *Wild Strawberries* and *L’avventura* deal with ‘real problems (contemporary alienation, lack of communication) [and use]

³⁶ A key feature of art cinema is its ‘interiorisation of dramatic conflict’ (Neale, 2002: 104) and focus on ‘alienation [and] lack of communication’ (Bordwell, 2002: 96). In this way, ‘art cinema is less concerned with action than reaction [and] is a cinema of psychological effects in search of their causes’ (Bordwell, 2002: 96).

³⁷ As Greenaway notes: ‘[y]ou would hardly think that the cinema had discovered James Joyce sometimes. Most [...] cinema [...] is modeled on Dickens and Balzac and Jane Austen’ (Brookes, 2004: 6).

³⁸ According to Mast, post-war European cinema ‘in effect [...] brought movies into the “mainstream” of modernism’ (Mast, 1985: 281). Siska contends rather, that the art film as a modernist narrative film ‘seems to have begun about a dozen years after World War II, in the late fifties’ (Siska, 1980: 2) with films such as Fellini’s *La Strada* (1954), Bergman’s *Wild Strawberries* (1957) and Resnais’ *Hiroshima, Mon Amour* (1959). See also Neale (1981: 42) and (2002: 104); Hedling (1997: 178) and Bordwell (2002: 94).

³⁹ Bordwell notes that in an art film the ‘story will often lack a clear-cut resolution’ (2002: 99), as in the endings of *L’avventura* (1960) and *Les Quatre-Cent Coups* (1959). Furthermore, where ‘the characters of the classical narrative have clear-cut traits and objectives, the characters of the art cinema lack defined desires and goals [...] Hence a certain drifting episodic quality to the art film’s narrative. Characters may wander out and never reappear; events may lead to nothing’ (Bordwell, 2002: 96). See also Neale (2002:)

⁴⁰ Neale, for example, notes that art films ‘tend to be marked by a stress on visual style’ (2002: 104), which serve to differentiate them from the ‘institutionalised spectacle’ (2002: 104) of Hollywood. Hence the jump-cuts in early works of the *Nouvelle Vague*, the time distortions in films such as *Hiroshima, Mon Amour* (1959) and the extended takes of filmmakers such as Jancso. See also Bordwell (95-99).

‘realistic’ - that is psychologically complex characters’ (2002: 95-6).⁴¹

The concept of art cinema then, as outlined by Bordwell, Neale and Mast, is ‘linked to particular aesthetic and industrial developments in Europe during the post-war period [...] the label “art ” serving to differentiate European production by recourse to a notion of cultural value or seriousness regarded as absent from populist American entertainment’ (Petrie, 2000: 149). While this definition is commonly used by critics in works on art cinema, and shall be used, to a certain degree, in this thesis, it is important to acknowledge its limitations.⁴² For example, this definition, with its concentration on European films is somewhat restrictive, and art cinema, in its expanded of form, ‘is also the institutional and aesthetic space into which the work of directors from beyond Europe [such as Yasujiro Ozu, Akira Kurosawa, Sayajit Ray and Ousmane Sembene] have been integrated’ (Darke, 1996: 173).

Furthermore, as Hill has noted, Bordwell’s definition of art cinema ‘is too tied to the 1960s and fails to do justice to the range of textual strategies employed by art cinema in the 1980s and 1990s’ (1997: 247). Indeed, while a relatively recent British art film such as Leigh’s *Naked* may neatly conform to this definition of art cinema, with its episodic, drifting and finally unresolved narrative, focus on contemporary alienation and social problems, and presentation of authentic locations and psychologically complex characters, other British art films of the period do not. For example, Paula Willoquet-Maricondi argues that if one ‘were to limit [oneself] to Bordwell’s assessment of what art cinema is, Greenaway’s films would only

⁴¹ There is something of a contradiction between Bordwell’s insistence that art films defined themselves in terms of realism and Wollen’s later suggestion that ‘realism’ was at odds with both cinematic modernism and the idea of a ‘New Wave’ (See Wollen, 1993: 35-51). This contradiction only highlights the lack of consensus over what critics mean by the term art cinema.

⁴² For example, it is arguable that ‘art films have departed from the mainstream in such a variety of ways that it is very difficult to assimilate art cinema into any one single category’ (Hill, 2000 (a): 23). See also Nowell-Smith (1996: 567-75); O’Pray (1996 (c): 178-90); Hill (1997: 245-6) and (2000 (a):

problematically fit into this category' (2001 (a): 32). While the authorial stamp that is key ingredient of art cinema 'is clearly felt in his films' (2001: 32) the majority of Greenaway's are shot in a studio and not on location and rarely present the audience with believable, psychologically complex characters.⁴³ Equally, certain works by Jarman pose problems. While films such as *Sebastiane* (1976), *The Tempest* (1979) and *Caravaggio* (1986) are films made in the tradition of filmmakers such as Fellini, Pasolini and Cocteau and belong to the kind of art cinema defined above,⁴⁴ other films in his oeuvre, such as *The Last of England* (1987) and *The Garden* (1990) come across as 'doggedly anti-naturalistic, abandoning narrative or psychological exploration, [...] replacing it with an unusual vocabulary of image, symbolism, colour and sound' (Hacker and Price, 1991: 233) derived, in part, from traditions of avant-garde filmmaking.⁴⁵ The films of Terence Davies, which combine elements of British social-realism with a complex post-modern aesthetic drawn from both European art cinema and classical Hollywood, also confound this definition.⁴⁶

Therefore, while the definition of art cinema set out by Bordwell *et al* remains useful, it is also slightly outmoded as the nature of art cinema has changed somewhat since the 1980s, as the modernism of filmmakers like Fellini and Antonioni morphed into the postmodernism of filmmakers such as Raoul Ruiz, Lars von Trier, Abbas Kiarostami, Jarman and Greenaway.⁴⁷ Indeed, while critics such as Peter Wollen have

23-8); Willoquet-Maricondi (2001 (a): 32).

⁴³ Willoquet-Maricondi notes that Greenaway rather 'prides himself in creating characters who are 'coat hangers' for ideas' (2001 (a): 32). A possible exception to this is the character of Kracklite in *The Belly of an Architect* (1987). See Hacker and Price (1991: 202-7).

⁴⁴ See O'Pray (1996 (c): 178).

⁴⁵ This synthesis of art cinema and the avant-garde is particularly problematic in view of Bordwell's argument that art films 'have a role altogether different from *Rio Bravo* on one hand and *Mothlight* on the other' (2002: 94). See O'Pray (1996 (c): 179) and Rees (1999: 98-102).

⁴⁶ See Hunt (1999: 1-16) and Everett (2004: 58-63).

⁴⁷ This is partly due to the assimilation of many of the techniques of 1960s modernist art cinema into the Hollywood mainstream. As Bordwell notes 'art cinema has had an impact on the classical cinema [and] we have seen an art cinema emerge in Hollywood' (Bordwell, 2002: 100) in the work of

directly linked the work of Jarman and Greenaway with modernism and the European cinema of the 1960s,⁴⁸ others have seen ‘the intertextuality and eclecticism, the erosion of aesthetic and technological boundaries, and signifiatory play associated with postmodernism [...] as the predominant features [of their work]’ (Hill, 2000 (a): 27). Similar claims could be made for the films of Davies,⁴⁹ and Potter⁵⁰, which equally show a ‘fascination with quotation’ (Everett, 2004: 108), parody, eclecticism, and, in the case of the latter, a hybridisation of art cinema with elements of the avant-garde and other art forms.⁵¹ Ultimately, while elements of the classic modernist art cinema of the 1960s are recognisable in all their films, it is their combination of these elements with more postmodern concerns that have allowed these British filmmakers, and contemporary art cinema in general, to evolve from its 1960s heyday and remain both relevant and in opposition to mainstream narrative cinema.

Perhaps the key ways in which this contemporary art cinema has evolved from this classic model can be found in the ideas of eclecticism and hybridisation, which are not only central to one’s understanding of the work of these individual directors, but also of British art cinema in general.⁵² Indeed, this thesis will demonstrate that British art cinema, like those of Europe, is multifaceted and although the concerns and styles of contemporary British filmmakers such as Leigh and Greenaway may at first seem too disparate to be grouped together, this is in keeping with the nature of art

filmmakers such as John Cassavetes, Woody Allen, Arthur Penn and Robert Altman. Therefore, the aesthetics and concerns of art cinema must alter themselves in order to maintain the opposition to Hollywood that is amongst its defining features. See also Neale (1981: 44), Orr (2000: 1-19) and Hill (2000 (a): 26-7).

⁴⁸ See Wollen (1993: 35-51).

⁴⁹ See Hunt (1999: 8-16) and Everett (2004).

⁵⁰ See Rich (1998: 220-33) and Foster (2002: 272-9).

⁵¹ See Potter (1997: vii-viii).

⁵² For example. Willoquet-Maricondi and Alemany-Galway argue that ‘any understanding of Greenaway as a filmmaker necessitates a broader understanding of him as a hybrid artist whose paintings, drawings, exhibitions, installations and operatic productions are intimately allied to and an intrinsic part of his work in cinema’ (2001: ix). Equally, O’Pray notes that many of Jarman’s films

cinema, which has always been something of a portmanteau term under which falls the often singular work of international *auteurs* as diverse as Fellini, Ozu and Jan Svankmajer. Therefore, just as the French *nouvelle vague* had room for the individual personalities and distinct concerns of filmmakers as varied as Godard, Truffaut, Resnais, Jacques Rivette, Eric Rohmer, Chris Marker, Agnes Varda and Jacques Demy,⁵³ contemporary British art cinema ‘may be seen to include [...] the ‘realism’ of Ken Loach and Mike Leigh and the postmodern aesthetic experiments of Derek Jarman and Peter Greenaway’ (Hill, 1997: 247), the autobiographical concerns of Douglas and Davies, the gender politics of Potter and the existential thrillers of Petit.

Why ‘Context and Practice’?

This thesis shall largely concern itself with examining two general aspects of British art cinema between 1975 and 2000; namely, how the British art cinema operates as an art cinema in the *context* of its 1960s and 1970s European counterparts⁵⁴ and how the individual filmmaking *practices* of these British directors both conform to and deviate from classic definitions of art cinema. In this way, this thesis shall demonstrate the ways in which British art cinema can be characterised not only as a belated continuation of classic European art cinema but also a significant

shared elements of avant-garde and art cinema in ‘an eclectic, hybrid manner’ (O’Pray, 1996 (c): 178).

⁵³ Kinder and Houston note that ‘[t]he French new wave is not a film movement in the same way as Italian neo-realism. It is not made up of a group of filmmakers who share a theoretical approach to film and politics; nor does it consist of a body of films that express similar themes through similar techniques [...] Essentially [...] it is the result of an economic condition that enabled new young directors to transform the French cinema temporarily, not in any one consistent direction, but in a variety of ways’ (1972: 181). Much the same could be said in regard to British art cinema.

⁵⁴ A precedent is set here by the Bristol cinema which in 1982 showed a programme of films called ‘The Draughtsman’s Context’ which included ‘all those film that by accident or design, unconsciously or quite consciously influenced the film’ (Jaehne, 2000: 22), including Resnais’ *Last Year at Marienbad*, Eric Rohmer’s *The Marquise von O* (1976) and Fellini’s *Casanova* (1976).

development from it. Therefore, it shall examine the work of key British art filmmakers in the context of art cinema history, linking it with earlier movements in European art cinema such as Italian *neo-realism* and the French *Nouvelle Vague*, individual forebears such as Resnais, Godard, Pasolini and Wenders, and previous examples of art films in Britain.

Furthermore in examining the filmmaking practices of these leading British art cinema directors this thesis will demonstrate British art cinema's stylistic and thematic eclecticism. Taken as a whole, it engages not only with its European counterpart, but with a wide range of influences including classical Hollywood, pop art, structural cinema and music videos as well as more typically British cinematic traditions such as the documentary and social realism. British art film directors have also experimented with new and existing filmmaking technologies and techniques, and made advances in cinematic style and the treatment of subject matter from their European colleagues of the 1960s and 1970s.⁵⁵

To investigate these claims, the chapters in this thesis shall not address individual films or filmmakers, but rather, to allow a greater breadth of analysis, will examine their individual attitudes towards factors such as realism and film narrative, and their ties with the cinematic avant-garde and Hollywood as well as European art cinema, that can help to contextualise their films in the traditions of both European art cinema and British cinema itself. Chapter One will provide a brief critical overview of art cinema in Britain before 1975, thereby contextualising contemporary British art cinema's place in British film history, and highlighting the changes in the British film industry that made the growth of British art cinema possible. Several key aspects of British art cinema shall then be examined individually to illustrate the way in which

these factors have helped to shape and characterise British art cinema. Chapter Two will analyse the attitudes of British art filmmakers towards the modes of cinematic realism that have perhaps come to dominate British film history. Chapter Three addresses the attitudes of British art filmmakers towards narrative, and will examine the degree to which they have rejected the classical Hollywood narrative in favour of modernist, structuralist, and other less traditional methods of cinematic storytelling. Chapter Four will examine the avant-garde roots of several contemporary British art filmmakers and illustrate the ways in which some of the ideas and techniques of avant-garde filmmaking have carried over into their subsequent work in art-house feature films. Finally, Chapter Five will address the influence of both Hollywood and European art-house styles of filmmaking on British art cinema. It shall also demonstrate how these often contradictory influences have helped to mould the latter's distinctive shape, and highlight the disparity amongst British filmmakers between those who look towards Hollywood for inspiration and financial backing and those who choose to operate in the culturally richer but financially poorer European cinema.

British Art Cinema Before 1975.

Although the next chapter will provide a more detailed examination of the work of key movements and filmmakers in British art cinema before 1975, it is useful at this juncture to outline briefly the history of art cinema in Britain in order to help demonstrate the ways in which British art cinema over the final quarter of the twentieth century was unique in its national cinema but not entirely without precedent.

⁵⁵ See Park (1984: 14).

Britain was slow to adopt modernist principles into what passed as its art cinema. Rather, in the 1920s and 1930s, when the first wave of cinematic modernism appeared in Europe, in the work of filmmakers such as Abel Gance, Sergei Eisenstein, Jean Cocteau, Jean Vigo and Luis Buñuel, the British Documentary Movement, under the direction of John Grierson,⁵⁶ sought to distinguish itself from the Hollywood-style mainstream through a commitment to realism over escapism,⁵⁷ and from European art cinema, with an emphasis on social concerns over artistic and formal innovation.⁵⁸

The British Documentary Movement thrived from the late 1920s until after the Second World War, and represented both British cinema's most lasting single movement and its most sizable contribution to world cinema to date.⁵⁹ Certainly, British cinema's commitment to realism before and during the Second World War influenced subsequent trends in post-war European art cinema, most notably Italian *neo-realism*, which brought an unprecedented level of *verisimilitude* into fictional filmmaking and in turn influenced the British filmmakers of the 'New Wave'. However, the Documentary Movement's pervasive influence on its own national cinema was also somewhat detrimental to the development of art cinema in Britain. Indeed, the only major counter to realism in British cinema before the late 1970s emerged directly after the Second World War, in the 'neo-romantic' work of filmmakers such as Carol Reed,⁶⁰ Laurence Olivier,⁶¹ David Lean⁶² and, above all, the

⁵⁶ See Aitkin (1990); Bryant (1997); Ellis (2000), and Ellis and McLane (2005: 73-4).

⁵⁷ See Murphy (1989: 34-60) and Wollen (1993: 37-8).

⁵⁸ See Lovell (1969: 2-3) and Hill (2000 (a): 18). However, as I shall argue in Chapter One, there was some engagement with European modernism at the peripheries of the British Documentary Movement, most notably in the work of animators such as Len Lye and Norman McLaren and filmmakers such as Alberto Cavalcanti and Humphrey Jennings.

⁵⁹ See Higson (1986: 72-97).

⁶⁰ See Evans (2005).

⁶¹ See Holden (1988: 184-223) and Olivier (1992: 199-193).

⁶² See Brownlow (1996: 169-250).

team of Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger.⁶³ While these filmmakers are best viewed as producers of mainstream films of pronounced artistic quality rather than of art films in the European sense, they still exerted a strong influence over many of the future directors of British art cinema such as Jarman, Davies and Potter⁶⁴ by demonstrating - in the Technicolor grandeur and spectacle of Powell and Pressburger's *A Matter of Life and Death* (1946) and Olivier's *Henry V* (1944), and in the expressionism of Lean's *Great Expectations* (1946) and Reed's *The Third Man* (1949) - that British cinema could move away from realism and be visually, rather than socially, oriented. Furthermore, the post-war works of Powell and Pressburger, in particular *The Red Shoes* (1948) and *Tales of Hoffman* (1951), while in some ways atypical of European art films, still bear the art-house hallmarks of auteurism and serious artistic intent.⁶⁵

It is perhaps ironic that British art cinema entered into its sole period of anti-realism at the same time as European art cinema entered into its most conventionally realistic phase. This inversion however, has repeatedly been the case with British art cinema's relationship with its continental equivalent. For example, when modernism began to re-emerge in European cinema in the mid 1950s, through the work of Fellini, Bergman, Robert Bresson and Andrzej Wajda, before its dramatic uptake in 1959, realism began to dominate British cinema once again. As a result, modernism played only an incidental part in British cinema before the late 1970s. The filmmakers who comprised both Free Cinema and the British 'New Wave' that grew out of it defined

⁶³ See Christie (1978: 53-8), Powell (1986) and (1990), Russell (1993: 100-109), and MacDonald (1996).

⁶⁴ Potter noted that Powell's films hover in a 'magic zone' between realism and non-realism (Humm, 1997: 172). Potter also co-dedicated *Orlando* to Powell (Potter, 1992: 74) and made explicit reference to several of his films, including *The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp* (1943), *The Red Shoes* and *Gone with the Wind* in it. See Humm (1998: 119) and Hoyle (2005: 203-12). See also Jarman (1984: 216).

⁶⁵ Ken Russell called *The Red Shoes*, 'the first art film in the history of the British Cinema' (Russell,

their work in terms of realism, and again reacted not only against Hollywood escapism, but also against European modernist experimentation and the romanticism of Powell and Pressburger and Carol Reed. However, the British 'New Wave' which coincided with the emergence of the *nouvelle vague* in France and the release of Antonioni's *L'avventura* and Fellini's *La Dolce Vita* in Italy between 1959 and 1960, as I shall demonstrate in the next Chapter, remains problematic when viewed as both art cinema and a proper 'New Wave'.⁶⁶

Although the influence of European modernism, the *nouvelle vague* and filmmakers such as Antonioni did slowly enter into the work of native British directors, as can be seen in films such as Richardson's American-financed adaptation of Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones* (1963)⁶⁷ and Jack Clayton's *The Pumpkin Eater* (1964),⁶⁸ it was ironically the work of émigré directors such as Antonioni, Losey, Richard Lester, Roman Polanski, working in Britain, that bore the strongest comparisons with European art cinema.⁶⁹ By the late 1960s and early 1970s however, the release of films such as Anderson's *If...* (1968) and *O, Lucky Man!* (1973), and Nicolas Roeg and Donald Cammell's *Performance* (1970)⁷⁰ showed that native British directors were capable of producing modernist art films that were as experimental, innovative and complex as any made on the Continent. These films, together with works such as Ken Russell's *The Devils* (1971), Loach's *Kes* (1969), Leigh's *Bleak Moments* (1971), and Bill Douglas' autobiographical *My Childhood* (1972) and *My Ain Folk* (1973), hinted, perhaps for the first time, at the possibility of a British art

1991: 34). See also Lazar (1989: 20).

⁶⁶ See Lovell (1969: 2-4); Wollen (1993: 35-9) and Hedling (1997: 178-86) and (2003: 23-5).

⁶⁷ See Bayer (1973: 81).

⁶⁸ See Sinyard (2000: 109-129).

⁶⁹ See Street (1997: 165-8).

⁷⁰ Although technically made in 1968, *Performance* underwent two years of editing, by various hands, before Warner Bros. deemed the film fit to release in 1970 (see MacCabe, 1998: 57-62). See also

cinema comprised of domestic talent and showing a diversity of styles - the modernism of Roeg, the romanticism of Russell, the poetic realism of Douglas and the more conventional realism of Loach and Leigh - that was in keeping with the varied European model.

However, British art cinema in the late 1960s and early 1970s lacked the cohesion it would later develop in the late 1970s and 1980s, when factors such as opposition to the Thatcher government and the emergence of Channel Four provided a common ideological voice and a more secure base for the funding and distribution of non-mainstream films. As a result, Anderson was silent for almost a decade until his anti-Thatcherite satire, *Britannia Hospital* (1982)⁷¹; Russell and Roeg increasingly began to make American films, both in terms of their financial backing, settings, casts and content;⁷² and Loach and Leigh worked predominantly in television before returning to feature films in the late 1980s.⁷³

The Emergence of Contemporary British Art Cinema.

In the 1980s, art cinema became 'the predominant model of British filmmaking' (Hill, 1997: 246) and British cinema, began to define itself far less ambiguously as an extension of European cinema, financially, aesthetically and thematically. In the late 1970s, the British Film Institute which had previously supported more 'typically' British projects such as the Free Cinema documentaries of Tony Richardson, Karel Reisz and Lindsay Anderson,⁷⁴ shifted its focus towards funding more overtly experimental works, such as Susan Clayton and Jonathan

O'Pray (1996 (c): 179-80)) and Sinyard (2003: 112).

⁷¹ See Hedling (1998: 176-197).

⁷² See Walker (1985 (b): 98).

⁷³ See Fuller (1998: 63-78) and Coveney (1997: 83-150).

Curling's *The Song of the Shirt* (1979)⁷⁵ and Greenaway's avant-garde short film *A Walk Through H* (1978). However, it also began - perhaps partly spurred on by the success of independently productions such as Jarman's *Sebastiane* (1976) and *Jubilee* (1977) and Ron Peck's *Nighthawks* (1978)⁷⁶ - to produce innovative, though more commercially viable feature films such as Petit's *Radio On* (1979).⁷⁷ The release of these films again began to suggest the possibility of a European-style art cinema in Britain. However, these films differed from British art films made earlier in the decade in the comparative modesty and independence of their productions.⁷⁸ Films such as *Performance*, *The Devils* and *O, Lucky Man!* had substantial budgets and received international distribution, if not full funding, from a major Hollywood studio - Warner Brothers - whereas Jarman's films and those funded by the British Film Institute each cost under one hundred thousand pounds to make.⁷⁹ The low cost of these films meant that the idea of a British art cinema was finally financially sustainable. Films made on such limited budgets had only to perform adequately at the box-office to turn a small profit, and, in the event of a flop, the potential loss was greatly decreased. Furthermore, these budgetary constraints encouraged filmmakers to innovate with form and technique in their films, as they could not rely on lavish and expensive spectacles to win an audience's favour.

⁷⁴ See Ellis (1977: 29-35).

⁷⁵ See Clayton and Curling et al (1981: 100-29) and O'Pray (1999 (c): 179-80).

⁷⁶ See Walker (1985 (a): 150-2).

⁷⁷ This change in direction at the BFI was largely spearheaded by Peter Sainsbury, the then head of the BFI's production board. For more details, see Sainsbury (1981: 9-11) and Park (1984: 73-5).

⁷⁸ O'Pray argues that by the late 1980s, 'the funding of film production and the general cultural context of cinema had changed to such an extent that it is much more difficult to make [...] clear-cut distinctions, with each of the strands absorbed into a broader front of film-making which yet has no shared project, whether cultural, political or aesthetic. In the 1970s, however, the boundaries between such films as *Berlin Horse* (1970), *Performance* (1970), *Sebastiane* (1976) and *The Song of the Shirt* (1979) seemed much more obvious' (1996 (c): 179).

⁷⁹ Jarman, who acted as set designer on *The Devils*, notes that the principal set of the film, the white-walled town of Loudon, cost £97,000 (1984: 100), over three times the total budget of his debut feature, *Sebastiane* (Peake, 1999: 217). The budget for *Jubilee* is estimated between £50,000-80,000 (Peake, 1999: 547).

An additional repercussion of the British Film Institute's decision to focus on low-budget feature filmmaking was the move towards European rather than American sources for additional funding and distribution. With their government-subsidised television and film industries, which also encouraged cultural and artistic merit over commercial viability, and operated on an equally modest scale, European countries such as France, Germany and the Netherlands made far more suitable partners for international co-productions with British producers such as the BFI and later Channel Four than the more profit-seeking Hollywood studios.⁸⁰ The model for this practice is perhaps Petit's *Radio On*, half the budget of which was provided by Wim Wenders' 'Road Movies Filmproduktion', with the German director acting as executive-producer. Subsequently, European co-productions have become the norm for a number of other British art filmmakers including Jarman, Greenaway, Potter, Leigh and Loach.⁸¹

As a result of this shift in financial input into British art films, there has also come a complementary shift in the target audience of British art films. Films such as Petit's *Flight to Berlin* (1983), Greenaway's *A Zed and Two Noughts* (1985), Jarman's *Caravaggio* (1986), Loach's *Fatherland* (1986), and the Quay Brothers' *Institute Benjamenta* (1995), to name but a few, are clearly designed to appeal to an Anglo-European rather than an Anglo-American audience. This can be seen in these films' use of European locations, (Berlin in *Flight to Berlin* and *Fatherland*, and Rotterdam in *A Zed and Two Noughts*), culture (the paintings of Caravaggio in Jarman's film and Vermeer in Greenaway's; the use of Robert Walser's novel *Jacob von Gunten* as the basis for *Institute Benjamenta*) and language (both Loach's and

⁸⁰ See Caughie and Rockett (1996: 177-80).

⁸¹ For example, European film funding initiatives such as EURIMAGES (founded in 1988 although

Petit's films are partly in German). Furthermore, much in the same way as British films typically cast an Hollywood actor in a central role to ensure interest at the American box-office, some of these films cast notable European actors in major roles to appeal to continental audiences, such as Lisa Kreuzer⁸² and Eddie Constantine⁸³ in *Flight to Berlin*, Andréa Ferréol⁸⁴ in *A Zed and Two Noughts* and Fassbinder regular Gottfried John in *Institute Benjamenta*.

Aesthetically, British art film directors in the late 1970s and 1980s also began to show stronger ties with their European forebears. Jarman, for example, continually made comparisons between his work and that of Pier Paolo Pasolini.⁸⁵ He felt a kinship with the Italian director not only as a fellow queer filmmaker, but also as another director who had amassed an unshakable - though he believed undeserved - reputation for controversy, despite being drawn to 'traditional' material.⁸⁶ For example, Jarman often likened *The Garden* (1990), his version of Christ's Passion,⁸⁷ to Pasolini's *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (1963) (Peake, 1999: 467), and argued that neither was the blasphemous work some critics labelled it as, but rather

Britain belatedly joined in 1993) provides financial support to films made in collaboration between three or more member countries. See Caughie and Rockett (1996: 177-80).

⁸² Kreuzer had major roles in many of the early German films of Wim Wenders, including *Alice in the Cities* (1974) and *The American Friend* (1977).

⁸³ French-American actor and singer notable for his iconic appearance as Lemmy Caution in Godard's *Alphaville* (1965) and his role in Fassbinder's *Beware of a Holy Whore* (1970).

⁸⁴ A French born actress whose previous appearances included Marco Ferreri's *La Grande Bouffe* (1973), Rainer Werner Fassbinder's *Despair* (1978), Volker Schlöndorff's *The Tin Drum* (1979) and Truffaut's *The Last Metro* (1980).

⁸⁵ Jarman frequently acknowledges his admiration of Pasolini's films in his own writing. In *Dancing Ledge*, for example, he writes: '[h]ad *Caravaggio* been reincarnated in this century it would have been as a film-maker, Pasolini' (1984: 9-10). He also proudly mentions Alberto Moravia's comment that *Sebastiane* 'was a film Pier Paolo would have loved' and his own earlier meeting with the director (1984: 165-6). Jarman also appeared as the director in a short student film, *Ostia*, by Julian Cole in 1986 (Peake, 1999: 361). See also Berani and Dutoit (1999: 7-21).

⁸⁶ In *Modern Nature*, Jarman writes: 'Shakespeare, the *Sonnets*, *Caravaggio*, Britten's *Requiem*, what more traditional subject matter could a film-maker take on? And yet I'm still seen by some as a menace' (1992: 234). Similarly, Pasolini had developed a reputation as an *agent provocateur* through his controversial adaptations of such canonical literary works as *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (1964), *Oedipus Rex* (1967), *Medea* (1970), *The Decameron* (1970), *The Canterbury Tales* (1971) and *The Arabian Nights* (1974). See Stack (1969: 119-31), Viano (1993: 47-67; 173-186; 236-311) and Rohdie (1995).

both were deeply spiritual films (Peake, 1999: 453). Other British directors showed their debt to and kinship with classic European art cinema even more overtly in their films. Petit's *Radio On*, for instance, as I shall demonstrate in Chapter Five, was directly inspired by the road movies of Wenders, *Alice in the Cities* (1974) and *Kings of the Road* (1976). Similarly, Greenaway derived the unresolved mystery plot of *The Draughtsman's Contract* (1982) from Resnais' *Last Year at Marienbad* (1960) and from Antonioni's *Blow-Up*. He also collaborated on all of his films since *A Zed and Two Noughts* (1985) with the French cinematographer Sasha Vierny, who shot Buñuel's *Belle de Jour* (1967) and many of the films of Resnais, Greenaway's cinematic idol.⁸⁸ Even Loach and Leigh, whose work is largely free from such overt intertextual allusions⁸⁹ claim a certain kinship with European directors such as DeSica, Rossellini, Renoir, Milos Forman and Ermanno Olmi as well as the British realist tradition.⁹⁰

Contemporary British art cinema was the first 'movement' in British cinema (albeit something of an unofficial one), since the 'neo-romantic' films of the 1940s and early 1950s, that did not wholly define itself in terms of realism. Rather, it contains filmmakers such as Loach, Leigh and Douglas whose work is identifiably part of the British realist tradition, and others, such as Jarman, Greenaway, Petit, Davies and Potter, whose engagement with cinematic realism is more complex. For example, as I argue in Chapter Two, the films of Leigh, Loach and Douglas generally conform to the normalised view of what is 'realistic' in cinema.⁹¹ Their films usually feature linear narratives which seem to respect notions of temporal reality, and contain

⁸⁷ In Jarman's film Christ is replaced by two gay lovers.

⁸⁸ See Ciment (2000: 33, 39, 159), Siegel (2000: 77) and Turman (2000: 151).

⁸⁹ For example, see Lawrenson (2005: 12).

⁹⁰ See Leigh (1995: 113-17) and Bloch (2000: 24-5).

⁹¹ See Kracauer (1960); Balász (1974) and Stam (2000: 15-25).

numerous ‘reality effects’⁹² such as authentic locations, sets, props, characters and dialects which are designed to heighten the films’ resemblance to material reality.⁹³ On the other hand, while the latter group of filmmakers do engage with reality in their work, they also, to varying degrees, seek to break down the resemblance to material reality that the realist cinema of their contemporaries foregrounds. For instance, films such as Jarman’s *Caravaggio* (1986), *Edward II* (1991) and *Wittgenstein* (1992), as well as Greenaway’s *The Cook, The Thief, His Wife and Her Lover* (1989), *Prospero’s Books* (1991) and *The Baby of Mâcon* (1993) are notably concerned with emphasising artifice, rather than reality. These films were all shot on studio soundstages, not actual locations, and flaunt rather than disguise this fact. Indeed, the lighting, art direction, set direction and general *mise-en-scène* of these films serve to produce a series of ‘anti-reality effects’ which alienate the films from conventional notions of *vraisemblance*. For example, the camera in *The Cook, The Thief, His Wife and Her Lover*, in a manner similar to Max Ophüls’ *Caught* (1949) and Roger Corman’s *The Masque of the Red Death* (1964), moves in long tracking shots through the walls of its primary setting, destroying the illusion of the ‘Hollandaise’ restaurant as a ‘realistic’ three-dimensional structure. Furthermore, as in Corman’s film, each successive room covered in these tracking shots has a distinctive colour palette - green for the kitchen, red for the dining room, white for the bathroom - that is greatly exaggerated and far removed from any sense of ‘natural’ lighting.

Essentially, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, modernism began to take a place alongside social realism as the defining factor of British art cinema.⁹⁴ This resulted in the complex balance of conventional social realism and modernist experiment present

⁹² See Barthes (1986: 141-8).

⁹³ See Auerbach (1954: 30-3).

in the autobiographical films of Terence Davies, such as *Distant Voices, Still Lives* (1988). This film combines a scenario typical of the former - a 'kitchen-sink' style drama set in a post-war working-class household, complete with reality effects such as authentic period detail - with a highly complex achronological narrative structure more typical of modernist works such as Bergman's *Wild Strawberries* and Resnais' *Hiroshima, Mon Amour*.⁹⁵ This duality encapsulates the way in which contemporary British art cinema as a whole draws from the history of its own mainstream cinema and that of continental Europe to create an art cinema that is at once classical and unique. However, Davies' work from the mid-1970s to the early 1990s shows a steady progression away from the conventions of British social realism towards a greater commitment to modernist structures and aesthetics. For example, the relatively linear narrative, 'realistic' locations and set design and stark black and white photography of the *Trilogy* (1976-83), give way to chronologically distorted 'memory narratives', increasingly unrealistic studio sets and highly stylised colour photography in *Distant Voices, Still Lives* and especially *The Long Day Closes* (1992) that further alienate the films from material reality.⁹⁶

Along with realism, the dominance of literary adaptations in British cinema has perhaps come at the expense of notable innovations or advancement in cinematic narrative. British literary adaptations, from the work of Laurence Oliver and David Lean, to the films of the British 'New Wave' or the 'heritage'⁹⁷ films of Merchant-Ivory⁹⁸ even when based upon modernist works, have tended to follow the linear narrative progression of the nineteenth-century realist novel, in a manner similar to

⁹⁴ See Wollen (1993: 35-51).

⁹⁵ See Andrew (1989: 72-3) and Hunt (1999: 1-16).

⁹⁶ See Williams (1993: 237-54), Falsetto (1999) and Everett (2004).

⁹⁷ See Higson (1996: 232-48) and (2003). Hill (1999: 73-98) and Vincendeau (2001).

⁹⁸ See Pym (1995) and Long (1997) and (2005).

Hollywood. In Chapter Three, I address the radically varying extents to which contemporary British art films react against this traditional narrative mode. The work of filmmakers such as Loach and Leigh, for example, typically follows the model of *neo-realist* films of the 1940s such as *Bicycle Thieves*, in that they maintain a reasonably linear chronology, but also begin to break down the cause-effect logic of classical film narrative, adding digressions and narrative asides, and often rejecting the clear-cut characters and resolutions of Hollywood in favour of more ambiguous characters and endings. Other British films of the period feature narratives more typical of modernist works, such as those of Kafka and Samuel Beckett, and their cinematic counterparts, such as *Blow-Up* and *Last Year at Marienbad*. For instance, *Radio On*, *The Draughtsman's Contract* and Jordan's *Angel*, like *Blow-Up* and Beckett's *Molloy*, all contain elements of a thriller or mystery plot where

clues lead nowhere; plans appear aimless and go significantly awry; characters shade into one another, as in dreams; events lack importance, at least in terms of plot; [and] meetings are arbitrary and lead to no new developments (Knowlson, 1996: 372).

Equally modernist in inclination are the autobiographical films of Davies and Jarman's *Caravaggio* which derive their narratives from the fragmented and even seemingly random nature of thoughts and memories rather than conventional, linear notions of storytelling. In this way, their films echo modernist literary experiments such as *stream-of-consciousness*, in which writers such as Joyce or Proust describe the unspoken thoughts of their characters 'often without logical sequence or syntax' (Drabble and Stringer, 1987: 542). The narratives of Davies' films, for instance,

progress from relatively straightforward flash-back structures in the *Trilogy* to far more complex series of temporal shifts and elisions in *Distant Voices*, *Still Lives* and *The Long Day Closes*. Here he almost entirely eschews traditional cinematic techniques - such as dissolves and fades - commonly used to introduce flashbacks and memories in a film narrative. The narratives of these later films are cyclical rather than linear, with no discernible beginning, middle or end. Instead, (often seemingly unrelated) episodes in his and his family's lives⁹⁹ are linked together with little deference to narrative coherence, by what Davies calls the 'emotional logic' (Falsetto, 1999: 76) of memory. Jarman's *Caravaggio* is structured along similar lines. Rather than base his film of the painter's life around one or more of many available biographical sketches,¹⁰⁰ Jarman instead chose to base it on his own personal 'biographical' reading of Caravaggio's painting. Like Beckett's *Malone Meurt* (1951), the film takes the form of an interior monologue that relays the last thoughts and recollections of a dying man moving in and out of consciousness. Jarman's narrative jumps from the hospital in Porto Ercole, where the artist lies dying, to a series of vignettes and *tableaux vivants* which cover episodes from his life, examine the artist's creative process and illustrate the biographical stories Jarman read into the paintings.

Despite its modernist sensibilities, *Caravaggio* remains one of Jarman's most conventional and accessible films. While it and films such as *Sebastiane*, *The Tempest* (1979), and *Edward II* were unquestionably art films cast in the European tradition of Pasolini, Fellini and Cocteau, other works, such as *The Angelic Conversation* (1985).

⁹⁹ Although semi-autobiographical, the *Trilogy*, presents fictitious and speculative episodes in the life of Tucker, Davies' surrogate. Equally, the narrative of *Distant Voices*, *Still Lives*, while largely set in the aftermath of the Second World War, after Davies' own birth in 1945, concentrates only on the lives and experiences of Davies' three eldest siblings, Eileen, Tony and Maisie. His other siblings, and Davies himself, in the form of Bud, are omitted until *The Long Day Closes*.

The Last of England (1987) and *The Garden* (1990), as I argue in Chapter Four, sought to reconcile the influence of European art cinema with the even more radical influence of the *avant-garde* cinema of filmmakers such as Andy Warhol and Kenneth Anger, with the commercial feature film.¹⁰¹ For example, *The Last of England*, bears many of the hallmarks of the *avant-garde*. Shot silently on light, hand-held Super-8 cameras,¹⁰² a typically ‘amateur’ film format favoured by *avant-garde* filmmakers for their ‘painterly’ qualities and affordability¹⁰³, and without a conventional shooting script,¹⁰⁴ Jarman and his collaborators shot hours of footage with a number of cameras and began to determine the film’s structure during the editing process. Jarman later added voiceovers to the film - drawn from his own writings - to provide a sense of narrative structure and coherence, however slight, that allowed the film to operate like a more conventional feature. Furthermore, the structures of both *The Last of England* and *The Garden* recall *avant-garde* ‘trauma-films’ such as Maya Deren’s *Meshes in the Afternoon* (1943) and Anger’s *Fireworks* (1947) in which the filmmakers themselves appear to dream or fantasise the film.¹⁰⁵

Other British art filmmakers with roots in the *avant-garde*, such as Peter Greenaway and Sally Potter, were also, although perhaps to lesser degrees, inclined to bring *avant-garde* influences to bear on their subsequent feature films.¹⁰⁶ Greenaway, for example, made a definite move from early works such as *A Walk Through H* and *The Falls* (1980) to the more conventional art-house sensibilities of *The*

¹⁰⁰ See Peter Robb (1998: 547-60).

¹⁰¹ See Hacker and Price (1991: 248-9); O’Pray (1996 (c): 178-90) and (2003: 108-9) and Rees (1998: 98-101).

¹⁰² See Jarman (1984: 128-38); (1987: 138-9); O’Pray (1996 (c): 66-70) and Peake (1999).

¹⁰³ See O’Pray (1996 (c): 66-7).

¹⁰⁴ Jarman wrote that he ‘improvised *The Last of England* – no scripts, scripts are the first restraint’ (1987: 163).

¹⁰⁵ See Rayns (1990: unnumbered); O’Pray (1996 (c): 73) and Sitney (2002).

¹⁰⁶ See O’Pray (1996 (c): 181) and Rees (1999: 98-101).

Draughtsman's Contract. However, his art-house feature films, while more in keeping with the work of Godard and Resnais, still betray the influence of structural cinema. For instance, the narratives of *A Zed and Two Noughts* and *Drowning by Numbers* (1988) are respectively based on alphabetical and numerical structures that progress from A to Z and 1 to 100 respectively, in a manner similar to Hollis Frampton's *Zorn's Lemma* (1970).¹⁰⁷ Potter, on the other hand, combined avant-garde techniques with those of Hollywood and art cinema in her debut feature, *The Gold Diggers* (1983), but adopted a more conventional and commercial style in subsequent features such as *Orlando* (1992) and *The Tango Lesson* (1997).

More recently, Potter's films such as *The Man Who Cried* (2000), and *Yes* (2005),¹⁰⁸ have seen her moving towards America for financial support and a potential audience. While this course of action is typical of mainstream British cinema, which has always had stronger ties with Hollywood than its European counterparts, for reasons of history, culture - and, of course, a shared language, and the potential of profit - it has also been the chosen path of many British directors working outside of the mainstream, including Ken Russell, Nicolas Roeg, Neil Jordan and Terence Davies.

While this thesis shall attempt to demonstrate the close ties contemporary British art cinema has made - formally, aesthetically and, to a lesser degree, financially - with European cinema as opposed to Hollywood, the influence of American cinema remains almost inescapable. Therefore, Chapter Five shall examine the often complex relationship between European art cinema and the American mainstream, and American genre cinema in particular, that has come to characterise

¹⁰⁷ See Pascoe (1997: 42-66); Testa (2001: 79-114) and Sitney (2002: 367-70).

¹⁰⁸ *Yes* (2005), despite a cast that includes the Hollywood-based American actress Joan Allen, retains

much British art cinema over the last quarter of the twentieth century.

Omissions and Further Research.

A number of other possible avenues of examination regarding British art cinema have been omitted. For instance, partly for reasons of length, and partly because these issues have been examined in detail elsewhere, the decision was made largely to abstain from discussions of British ‘heritage’ cinema,¹⁰⁹ the funding and distribution of British films,¹¹⁰ the problems of addressing British cinema as a ‘national’ cinema,¹¹¹ and British art cinema’s complex relationship with British television.¹¹²

Other omitted areas have been less comprehensively examined in critical works on British cinema. For example, studies of avant-garde filmmaking and its relation to art cinema in Britain have ‘rarely done justice to the full range of activities involved’ (O’Pray, 1996 (b): 178),¹¹³ and this thesis will do little to redress the balance. By virtue of concentrating on the most significant and prolific British art filmmakers of the last twenty-five years, little or no mention will be made of the work of Peter Wollen and Laura Mulvey,¹¹⁴ whose films in the 1970s and 1980s, *Penthesilea: The Queen of the Amazons* (1974),¹¹⁵ *Riddles of the Sphinx* (1977) and

something of Potter’s former sense of experimentation with a script written entirely in iambic pentameter.

¹⁰⁹ See Pym (1995); Long (1996); Vincendeau (2001) and Higson (2003).

¹¹⁰ See Porter (1985).

¹¹¹ See Richards (1997); Street (1997) and Higson (2002: 132-42).

¹¹² See Hill and McLoone (1996) and Caughie (2000).

¹¹³ As examples, O’Pray cites Harvey (1986: 225-51) and Wollen (1993: 35-51). See also Ellis (1977); Stoneman and Thompson (1981); Blanchard and Harvey (1983: 226-241); Street (1997: 169-73); and Dickinson (1999).

¹¹⁴ See MacDonald (1992: 333-44); Mulvey (1996: 199-216); O’Pray (1996 (b): 1-21) and Rich (1998: 59-73; 104-5).

¹¹⁵ See Dickinson (1999: 51-2) and Kelly (1999: 146-8).

Crystal Gazing (1982) put their film theories into practice¹¹⁶ and began to blur the lines between the two wings Wollen noted in the avant-garde.¹¹⁷ Nor does it address the significant contributions made to the British avant-garde and Independent film by organisations such as the Independent Film-maker's Association (IFA)¹¹⁸ and a number of filmmaking co-operatives and collectives such as the London Filmmakers' Co-op,¹¹⁹ Cinema Action,¹²⁰ the London Women's Film Group¹²¹ and Sankofa¹²², which began to emerge in the late 1960s and 1970s, and fostered the talents of filmmakers such as Wollen, Mulvey, Potter and Isaac Julien.¹²³

More room could also be given to discussing the implications of the British Film Institute's funding board's decision, under the guidance of Peter Sainsbury, to move away from funding overtly experimental avant-garde works to more commercially viable low-budget features,¹²⁴ and whether the subsequent commercial and critical successes of British Film Institute-funded films such as Greenaway's *The Draughtsman's Contract*, Potter's *The Gold Diggers* and Isaac Julien's *Young Soul Rebels* (1991), has come at the expense of something potentially more interesting in British experimental cinema.¹²⁵

Finally, there is also much scope for further research into the work of younger

¹¹⁶ Specifically the seminal articles 'The Two Avant-Gardes' (see Wollen, 1996: 133-44) and 'Visual Pleasure in Narrative Film' (see Mulvey, 1981: 206-15), both originally published in 1975. Mulvey commented to MacDonald that *Riddles of the Sphinx* 'in a way [...] developed out of these two texts' (1992: 334). See also Mulvey (1996: 199-218) and Wollen (2002: 74-82).

¹¹⁷ See Wollen (1996: 133-44) and O'Pray (1996 (c): 180).

¹¹⁸ See Blanchard and Harvey (1983: 234-241); Harvey (1986: 236-40); Abbot (1999: 168-70); Dickinson (1999: 48-53); IFA Conference Organising Committee (1999: 126-36); IFA (1999: 160-1)

¹¹⁹ See Leggett (1981: 142-3); Blanchard and Harvey (1983: 230-34); (Harvey, 1986: 236-40); O'Pray (1996 (c): 181-84); Le Grice (1999: 106-8) and Rees at <http://www.lfmc.org/>.

¹²⁰ See Blanchard and Harvey (1983: 231) and Dickinson (1999: 263-288).

¹²¹ The Group 'was formed in 1972 with two aims: to disseminate the idea of Women's Liberation and to enable women to learn the skill denied them in the industry' (Ellis, 1977: 121). See also, *The London Women's Film Group* (1999: 119-122).

¹²² See Malik (1996: 202-09); O'Pray (1996 (b): 20-1) and (1996 (c): 188-9); Pines (1997: 207-216) and (1999: 116-8) and Rees (1999: 105-7).

¹²³ For a more general view of Women's Film Co-ops see Lant (1993: 161-87).

¹²⁴ See Sainsbury (1981: 9-11).

British art filmmakers such as Julien, Chris Newby, Patrick Keiller, the Brothers Quay, Andrew Köttling, and John Maybury, who, like Jarman, Greenaway and Potter graduated from avant-garde shorts to art-house feature films, and who have continued to blur the distinction between the avant-garde and art cinema.¹²⁶ However, while their feature films, including Newby's *Anchoress* (1993) and *Madagascar Skin* (1995), Keiller's *London* (1994) and *Robinson in Space* (1997), the Brothers Quay's *Institute Benjamenta*, Köttling's *Gallivant* (1997) and *This Filthy Earth* (2001) and Maybury's *Love is the Devil* (1998), along with contemporary art films made in the more conventionally realist tradition, such as Gary Oldman's *Nil By Mouth* (1996), Peter Mullan's *Orphans* (1997) and *The Magdalene Sisters* (2002), Tim Roth's *The War Zone* and Lynne Ramsay's *Ratcatcher* (both 1999), represent some of the most interesting and challenging British features of the last fifteen years, the future of British art cinema remains uncertain.¹²⁷ For instance, the majority of these filmmakers, despite the critical and commercial success of their work, and numerous international awards, have to date made only one or two feature films and continue to struggle to work in Britain.

The reasons for this are complex and a thorough investigation would require an extended study. However, they generally point to a shift in the ambitions of the British film industry in the 1990s, when many of these filmmakers made their debut features. The mainstream of the British film industry, since the days of Alexander Korda in the 1930s, has seen 'Hollywood as a model to be emulated [and] take[n] on' (Wollen, 1993: 41) and like most commercially driven systems it operates with a 'boom/bust' mentality, which sees its fortunes cyclically rise and fall in relation to

¹²⁵ See Park (1984: 51-2).

¹²⁶ See O'Pray (1996 (c): 186-90) and (2003: 107-115).

British cinema's more general popularity with domestic and American audiences. The British film 'renaissance' of the 1980s was a particularly violent example of this 'boom/bust' cycle and left a vacuum in the British film industry which was filled with the artistically rather than commercially ambitious work of British art film directors, that dominated the remainder of the decade, and looked away from Hollywood, to Europe, for finance and an audience. In the 1990s however, the unexpected success of British films such as Jordan's *The Crying Game* (1992), Newell's *Four Weddings and a Funeral* (1993), Danny Boyle's *Trainspotting* (1995) and Peter Cattaneo's *The Full Monty* (1997) in America led British producers to attempt to take on Hollywood once again, but with different tactics. Rather than the multi-million pound epics of Goldcrest which tried to emulate the scale and budget of Hollywood studio films, these new films were modest productions made on a scale and budget similar to the art films of Greenaway and Loach, yet made millions of dollars at the American and international box-office. The films' producers, such as Film Four, which had previously been the patrons of British art cinema, thus began to move away from funding art films, which rarely made a significant financial return, in favour of making small films - typically comedies - that could find a wider commercial audience. As a result, British art cinema has once again been marginalized, and younger filmmakers such as Julien and Keiller, with little ambition to work in the mainstream, have found few producers willing to back non-commercial or experimental material and have rarely managed to make a second film.¹²⁸

This suggests a final area for further research, assessing the 'decline' and possible future of art cinema in Britain. Part of the reason British art cinema was able

¹²⁷ See Hill (2000 (a): 28-30) and Smith (2000 (a): 145-55).

¹²⁸ John Maybury, for example, after years of failing to secure funding for a long-cherished film on the

to exist, and indeed briefly thrive in the 1980s, was because of 'new production strategies which emerged in the wake of declining cinema audiences' (Hill, 1997: 247). Funding bodies such as the British Film Institute and later Channel Four were both willing to ignore the American market and were in a position to encourage experimentation and nurture young talent and place cultural value above commercial viability. By the early stages of the twenty-first century however, both had ceased to exist as film funding bodies.¹²⁹ In the case of the former, its film fund had been absorbed and later dissolved by The Film Council, Britain's new leading funding body, a decision which 'will probably be decisive in shaping the direction of British art cinema in the future' (Hill, 2000 (a): 30). However, the appointment of Alan Parker as the head of The Film Council and the continuing influence of David Puttnam over the government's policies towards film funding have certainly led away from an experimental and innovative film culture in favour of one which 'is likely to place a particular premium on the support of commercially oriented feature production' (Hill, 2000 (a): 30). Indeed, the government's push for a film industry that is 'distribution' led, and geared towards competition with Hollywood ominously recalls the Thatcher government's ironic decision to dub 1985 British Film Year, only months before the industry's almost total collapse.¹³⁰

In the present situation, given the anti-intellectualism of Parker, Puttnam and the power elite of the British film industry, and the fact that British producers are

life of Christopher Marlowe, finally relocated to Hollywood where he recently directed the thriller *The Jacket* (2005).

¹²⁹ The BFI film fund was dissolved by Alan Parker's Film Council. See Hill (2000 (a): 28-30). Channel Four, after an increasing move away from their 'culture over profit' attitude of the 1980s was bankrupted by a number of expensive flops that failed to capture either a domestic or foreign market, such as *Charlotte Gray* (2003). Film Four, as it is now known, now only acts as a distribution company.

See: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200203/cmselect/cmcmds/667/3062402.htm>

¹³⁰ See Walker (2004: 24-37).

almost all searching for the next big American success in the mould of *Four Weddings and a Funeral*, *The Full Monty* or *Bridget Jones' Diary* (2001), it is perhaps unsurprising that younger filmmakers such as Julien and Keiller, and even established ones with international reputations, such as Leigh, Greenaway and Davies, have struggled to get films funded in Britain. Yet, whilst British art cinema's future may thus be uncertain, it has - as this thesis shall indicate - a rich and recent past on which it can draw.

Chapter One: Art Cinema in Britain before 1975.

Upon the release of Chris Petit's *Radio On* in 1979, the critic Geoffrey Nowell-Smith noted that its British variation on the existential themes and modernist narratives of the work of European directors such as Wenders and Antonioni made it 'a film without a cinema' (1980: 30). Indeed, at the time of its release this seemed to be true, as Britain before the late 1970s did not have an art cinema in the manner of European countries such as France, Italy and Germany.¹ With hindsight however, the film was perhaps not the eccentric one-off that Nowell-Smith's comments would imply, and the emergence of contemporaries, such as Jarman, Greenaway, Douglas, Davies, Jordan, Potter and others in the late 1970s and early 1980s, whose work was equally cast in the various traditions of European art cinema, from Italian *neo-realism* to the experimental modernism of Antonioni and Resnais, began to suggest what a British art cinema in the European tradition might look like.

Previously, the place of art cinema in Britain had been occupied by the vastly different work of filmmakers such as John Grierson, Humphrey Jennings, the team of Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger, Joseph Losey, Lindsay Anderson and others.² While the work of these filmmakers only on rare occasions conformed to the idea of art cinema as modernist set out in the introduction to this thesis they were often born out of a similar sense of opposition to dominant trends in filmmaking, both international and domestic, as European art cinema.³ Indeed, the dominant trends in British art cinema before the late 1960s often ran in opposition to those of its

¹ See Hedling (1997: 179).

² See, for example, Lovell (1969: 2) and Wollen (1995: 20-3).

³ Furthermore, many of these films, which shall be examined below, have often been chosen to represent Britain at the international film festivals that have become so essential to the marketing, distribution and continued success and survival of art films, with films such as *If...* (1968) and Losey's *The Go-Between* (1970) both winning the *Palm d'Or* at the Cannes Film Festival.

continental equivalents. For example, the first wave of modernism in European cinema in the 1920s and 1930s, as typified by the work of filmmakers such as F.W. Murnau, Sergei Eisenstein, Dziga Vertov, Jean Cocteau and Jean Vigo ran parallel to the heyday of the British Documentary Movement in Britain. While European modernist films were characterised by an emphasis on experiments with the form, techniques and narratives of cinema that echoed those of modernist novelists such as Kafka, Joyce and Woolf,⁴ much of the work of the British Documentary Movement, under the direction and guidance of John Grierson, shunned such experimentation in favour of realism.⁵ Similarly, the films of Powell and Pressburger, as well as Laurence Oliver and Carol Reed during and immediately after the Second World War demonstrated a visual extravagance and often fantastical imagination that was in direct contrast to the austerity of the Italian *neo-realist* films that were part of European cinema after the war.

This sense of ‘neo-romanticism’ in British cinema, which ran parallel to similar movements in painting and poetry, with their emphasis on aesthetics, imagination and emotion, gave way, in the mid-1950s to a rebirth of realism in British literature and cinema, in the form of the novels and plays of the ‘Angry Young Men’ such as John Osborne and Alan Sillitoe and the ‘Free Cinema’ shorts and subsequent ‘British New Wave’ feature films of directors such as Richardson, Anderson and Karel Reisz. This return to realism as the dominant mode of British cinema ironically coincided with the second wave of modernism in European cinema, in the work of

⁴ See Hedling (1997: 178).

⁵ Ian Aitkin has however, made the case for Grierson’s modernist credentials in *Grierson and the Documentary Film Movement* (1990: 141-4), and there was, as I shall demonstrate below, a certain amount of room for modernism and experimentation at the peripheries of the British Documentary Movement, most notably, in works such as Alberto Cavalcanti’s *Pett and Pott* (1934) and *Coalface* (1935), the animations of Len Lye and Norman McLaren and Humphrey Jennings’ *Listen to Britain* (1942). See also Bryant (1997: 61-98); Duisinberre (1996: 65-83); Street (1997: 147-58); Ellis (2000:

Fellini, Antonioni and the directors of the French *nouveau vague*.⁶ In this chapter I shall assess the extent to which notable British films and filmmakers before 1975, beginning with the work of the British Documentary Movement, conformed to the criteria for art cinema set out in the introduction, and demonstrate the effect and influence they had on the generation of filmmakers who emerged as part of Britain's first art cinema in the late 1970s and 1980s.

The Beginnings of British Art Cinema: The British Documentary Movement.

Although this thesis is primarily concerned with examining fictional art films in Britain in the last quarter of the twentieth century, it remains essential to mention, however briefly, the work of the British Documentary Movement, which dominated British cinema from the late 1920s until the Second World War. Commonly viewed as 'the self-conscious creation of a single determined individual: John Grierson' (Macdonald and Cousins, 1998: 93),⁷ the British Documentary Movement not only forms Britain's most notable contribution to world cinema;⁸ its influence on its own national cinema - both in terms of documentaries and fiction films - has been nothing short of 'decisive' (Caughie and Rockett, 1996: 35). This influence has been

31-109); O'Pray (2003: 41-44) and Ellis and McLane (2005: 57-76).

⁶ See Siska (1980: 1-16) and Sinyard (2003: 123).

⁷ Although Grierson remains the 'most important influence on the development of the British documentary film' (Barsam, 1992: 95) his contribution to British and world cinema is less as a filmmaker than as a producer, mentor and publicist for the 'group of young, tremendously enthusiastic, but almost completely inexperienced, filmmakers, whom he trained and shaped into a movement' (Macdonald and Cousins, 1996: 93). He is also of enormous importance for the development of British cinema because of the institutions he established including the Empire Marketing Board Film Unit (1927-33), the General Post Office Film Unit (1933-39), and finally the Crown Film Unit, which had responsibilities for wartime propaganda and followed his model even after his retirement from the GPO film unit in 1937. See Aitkin (1990); Bryant (1997); Ellis (2000), and Ellis and McLane (2005: 73-4).

⁸ For example, Richard M. Barsam in his study of the documentary, *Non-Fiction Film*, cites the British Documentary Movement and the social realist movement it spawned as 'Britain's most permanent contribution to the development of world cinema' (1992: 110). See also Higson (1986: 72-97) and

‘inspiring and limiting’ (Macdonald and Cousins, 1998: 93) in equal measures, however. On one level its direct influence on the social-realist tradition of post-war British cinema in work as diverse as the output of Ealing studios in the 1940s and early 1950s to the more contemporary work of Ken Loach, Mike Leigh and Stephen Frears helped to define the ‘national’ voice of British film.⁹ However, this commitment to social realism has led to a suspicion and ambivalence in British cinema towards experimentation and innovation with the formal and aesthetic qualities of the medium.

While Grierson approached cinema as both a preacher and propagandist, in a manner in keeping with his strict Calvinist upbringing and non-dogmatic Marxist principles, and thought that ‘the only worthwhile type of cinema was factual and useful - of an educational and material benefit to society’ (Macdonald and Cousins, 1998: 94), the profound influence that his work and that of the filmmakers whose careers he helped to launch at the Empire Marketing Board Film Unit (1928-33), and its successor, the General Post Office Film Unit (1933-37) – e.g. Harry Watt, Basil Wright, Paul Rotha¹⁰ and others - have had on the trends of comparatively commercially orientated fiction filmmaking remains easy to detect. Grierson’s ultimate intention was to create a serious national cinema in Britain that was ‘morally superior to the Hollywood dream factory’ (Caughie and Rockett, 1996: 36). Thus the escapist and convoluted plots of Hollywood and mainstream British filmmaking were replaced by real-life subjects and scenarios that dealt directly with existing social problems such as the state of schools, public housing, social welfare, health care and unemployment. Furthermore, Grierson dispensed with the cut-glass tones and BBC

Cousins (2004: 158).

⁹ See Murphy (1989); Hill (1986), (2000 (b): 178-87) and (2000 (c): 249-60); Williams (1996: 190-1)

accents favoured by British actors even when playing working-class characters, and attempted to become 'the first filmmaker to put British working people on the screen' (Barsam, 1992: 90).¹¹ This treatment of social issues, rejection of Hollywood glitz and glamour, and use of non-professional actors not only pre-figured the moral and aesthetic concerns of Italian *neo-realism*, but also set the dominant tone of post-war British cinema, which despite the use of professional actors and more conventionally fictional scenarios, began to follow Grierson's model.¹² For example, the head of Ealing studios, Michael Balcon, talked of a preference for 'realism' over 'tinsel' (Murphy: 1989: 39)¹³, and even if Ealing comedies such as *Passport to Pimlico* (1949) and *The Man in the White Suit* (1951) do not immediately seem as distinct from notions of escapist entertainment as the more overtly serious work of Grierson's documentary movement, they are notable for their 'use of characters and action arising out of contemporary problems, such as were handled by the documentarists [and the] use [of] real places and real people' (Caughie and Rockett, 1996: 36).¹⁴ Equally, the subsequent films of British 'New Wave' directors such as Tony Richardson and Karel Reisz used not only authentic locations in their examinations of Northern working-class life, but also actors who came from that milieu, e.g. Albert Finney and Tom Courtenay, and whose regional accents lent an additional level of authenticity to their

and Lay (2002).

¹⁰ See Rotha (1952).

¹¹ According to Macdonald and Cousins, Grierson ultimately failed in this attempt and while the 'working classes in his films are praised for their craftsmanship and hard work [...] they are rarely humanised and allowed to speak for themselves' (1998: 95). This opinion was supported by Grierson's own sister, Ruby, who worked briefly for the movement before her death during the war. For example, *Housing Problems* (1935), on which she acted as 'assistant', was perhaps the first film of the movement to dispense with both a shooting script and post-recorded voiceover and rather let the film's subjects, slum-dwellers, 'tell their own story in their own words' (Macdonald and Cousins, 1998: 122).

¹² See Murphy (1989: 39).

¹³ See also Balcon (1943: 11); Murphy (1989: 34-42); and Wollen (1993: 37).

¹⁴ To help achieve this end, Balcon even brought Grierson's collaborator Alberto Cavalcanti to work at Ealing as both a filmmaker and as a creative advisor to the studio's younger directors, such as Charles Crichton, Robert Hamer and Alexander Mackendrick, after he left the GPO Film Unit. See Murphy

work.¹⁵

The Grierson model of documentary filmmaking differs greatly from more modern and familiar documentary forms such as *cinéma vérité* and its American counterpart 'Direct Cinema', which rejected pre-determined scripts and structures in favour of 'catching life unawares'.¹⁶ Rather, the films Grierson made and oversaw featured 'extensive use of actors, sets, continuity scripts and dialogues' (Macdonald and Cousins, 1998: 95), common attributes of fiction films, not documentaries, and perhaps 'few, if any, of the acknowledged classics of the [British] documentary movement would be classified as documentaries by today's purists' (Macdonald and Cousins, 1998: 95). Where a film by Jean Rouch or the Maysles Brothers would observe their 'characters' from a distance, allowing them to go about their business unimpeded by, if not unaware, of the camera, Wright and Watt's *Night Mail* (1936), which is perhaps the 'one film [...] generally recognised as embodying the essence of the documentary movement' (Macdonald and Cousins, 1996: 119), and Humphrey Jennings' equally seminal *Fires Were Started* (1943), 'place[d] no value on "catching life unawares"' (Macdonald and Cousins, 1996: 95).

Rather, both used shooting scripts with pre-determined scenes, sequences and dialogue that required their real-life postal workers and fire-fighters respectively to rehearse and read as 'actors'. In this way, the films of the British Documentary Movement are less documentaries in the modern sense of the term than a complex blend of documentary 'reality' and conventional fictional filmmaking. The scripts for these films avoided the conventional trappings of plot, narrative and characterisation

(1989: 36); Aitkin (2000).

¹⁵ See Hill (1986: 127-33); Street (1997: 80-2) and Ashby (2001: 179-191).

¹⁶ This idea perhaps has its roots, *inter alia*, in the work of Dziga Vertov, who dispensed with scripts and scenarios and whose theory of 'Kino Pravda', literally meaning 'Truthful Cinema', is echoed in the name *cinéma vérité*. See also Bawden (1976: 139-40); Issari (1979); Macdonald and Cousins (1998:

that define mainstream films. Rather they sought to reflect the reality of the situation they were portraying. The scenario of *Night Mail* thus seeks no drama outside of that inherent in the jobs of the postal-workers, sorting the mail, loading it onto the train and ensuring that it is delivered on time.

In this respect, the films of the British Documentary Movement foreshadow the works of British social-realist directors such as Loach, Leigh and others, that conform to a specific style of filmmaking, which, over time, has come to be culturally accepted as the most 'realistic' way of portraying the material world in film. This 'realist' style of filmmaking seeks to achieve a high level of *verisimilitude* through the foregrounding of what Roland Barthes referred to as 'reality effects' (Barthes, 1986) - a series of objects that exist in the material world which are placed in a work of art to heighten its resemblance to the reality from which they were drawn - such as authentic locations, props, costumes, characters and dialects¹⁷. This style also frequently relies on linear narratives, that seem to echo the natural progress of time and reject the aestheticism and technical virtuosity of much art cinema in favour of a simple, matter-of-fact style. However, while British filmmakers inherited Grierson's admirable commitment to a socially motivated cinema, his effect on British cinema was in other ways detrimental. Under his influence, art cinema in Britain from the 1930s to the early 1950s, 'had [largely] taken the form of the documentary film, which had characteristically subordinated aesthetics to educational and ideological purposes' (Hill, 2000 (a): 18).¹⁸ Therefore, Britain then had 'an art cinema [...] ambivalent about art [...] without the avant-garde impulse of much European modernism'

95); and Ellis and McLane (2005: 208-27).

¹⁷ See also Kracauer (1960); Montagu (1964: 279-98); Stephenson and Debrix (1965: 209-20); Hill (1986: 53-66); Hallam (2000: 3-23) and Armstrong (2005: 1-10). A more in-depth discussion of cinematic realism and its relation to British art cinema shall appear in Chapter Two.

¹⁸ See Lovell (1969: 2).

(Caughie and Rockett, 1996: 8-9), that evolved very little - formally, aesthetically and thematically - during this time. British cinema, as envisioned by Grierson and his successors, sought at once to exploit the mass appeal of cinema, and the accessibility of its language to educate, inform and alert the common people to the social problems that existed in the world, and Britain in particular.

In many ways realism was both the logical and obvious aesthetic choice for this task, for in its seemingly straightforward and objective presentation of events, it is not sensationalist, fantastical, or particularly experimental. While Grierson somewhat approved of the work of modernist European filmmakers such as Eisenstein, Alexander Dovzhenko and Walter Ruttmann¹⁹ - who too made films aimed at a mass audience - he saw more experimental techniques such as the radical montage employed by filmmakers such as Dziga Vertov as 'impotent and self-conscious art' (Barsam, 1992: 101) with the potential to alienate the mass audience they were trying to reach. For Grierson, '[t]he G.P.O. Film Unit [was] the only experimental centre in Europe' (Barsam, 1992: 101), not because of any innovations it made regarding the aesthetics and form of cinema, but for the entirely different reason that it was the sole place 'where the artist is not pursuing entertainment but purpose, not *art* but theme' (Barsam, 1992: 101; my emphasis). Grierson therefore defined his cinema in opposition to both dominant Hollywood practices *and* European modernism, an attitude echoed by the filmmakers who later comprised the 'Free Cinema' movement of the 1950s and the 'New Wave' it evolved into in the 1960s.²⁰ Like their predecessors in literature and theatre - the so-called Angry Young Men - these filmmakers looked upon realism as offering not only an escape from notions of film as

¹⁹ See Bawden (1976: 302) and (1976: 308); Ellis (2000: 37); and Cousins (2004: 106). Watt also admits to the influence of Flaherty, Dovzhenko and Eisenstein, see Macdonald and Cousins (1998:

frivolous entertainment, but also from the modernist experiments that dominated European art cinema of the time.

This basing of what passed for British art cinema on ‘sociological rather than aesthetic ideas’ (Caughie and Rockett, 1996: 36) until the 1970s, in part accounts for the tendency of critics to dismiss - or at least be ambivalent towards - British cinema, as it allowed for very little innovation with or evolution of film form. While the Italian *neo-realist* movement that Grierson influenced eventually morphed into the modernist auteurism of Fellini, Antonioni and Bertolucci, British realist cinema underwent little or no transformation (see Hallam, 2000: 51). For instance, in the 1990s, Loach stated that there was little point in trying to change or evolve his style of filmmaking, as it had been working well for over thirty years (Fuller, 1998: 87-8). Loach’s attitude is not without risks. Though one can detect a slight refinement of his style from earlier films such as *Kes* (1969) and *Family Life* (1971) to *Land and Freedom* (1995) and *My Name is Joe* (1997),²¹ they also suffer from a sense of sameness, a charge that cannot be so easily levelled against contemporaries more open to experiment, such as Jarman, Greenaway, Davies.

However, in some respects, it is incorrect to suggest that the British Documentary Movement’s commitment to social realism came entirely at the expense of experimentation and modernist ideas in British cinema. Rather, the movement was one in which the ‘contribution[s] of the avant-garde [were] acknowledged, [but] overt aestheticism was discouraged’ (Bawden, 1976: 200).²² For example, amongst the

109).

²⁰ See Hedling (1997: 178-86); (1998) and 2003 (23-34).

²¹ See Fuller (1998: 86-8) and Leigh (2002: 144).

²² Dusinberre argues that ‘the documentary and promotional films [made by the GPO Film Unit in the 1930s] should be re-analysed for evidence of their contribution to a modernist interrogation of the medium and, more importantly, that to the financial security and progressive connotations of working within the Film Unit should be added the attraction of enchanted *artistic* possibilities. Thus Len Lye

filmmakers Grierson assembled around him to create the movement were internationally renowned avant-garde artists such as Len Lye,²³ the New Zealand born animator, who ‘invented the technique known as ‘direct film’, [which involved] painting designs on to film stock without using a camera’²⁴ (Bawden, 1976: 431), and his fellow animator, Norman McLaren,²⁵ who made equally pioneering work in ‘direct films’ and also ‘sonic films’²⁶, operating on the peripheries of the movement. Alberto Cavalcanti was perhaps the most influential member of the movement next to Grierson. The Brazilian-born Cavalcanti, through his earlier French work, *Rien que les Heures* (1926), ‘represented a direct continuity with the continental avant-garde of the 1920s’ (Macdonald and Cousins, 1996: 112).²⁷ Although a confirmed realist, he was, unlike Grierson, also committed to experimentation in all facets of filmmaking, both documentary and fictional.²⁸ His relationship with Grierson was ‘always a little difficult’ (Macdonald and Cousins, 1996: 115). According to Macdonald and Cousins, Cavalcanti, who was initially hired by Grierson for his experience with film

and Norman McLaren no longer pose a serious contradiction within the history of the Film Unit, and the attraction of the Unit for young artists such as the painters [William] Coldstream and Jennings, the composers [Jack] Ellit and [Benjamin] Britten, and the poet [W.H.] Auden becomes not only understandable but, given the progressive aspirations still associated with the medium, almost inevitable’ (1996: 77).

²³ See Curnow and Horrocks (1984); Horrocks (2002); Sitney (2002: 233-5) and O’Pray (2003: 45-7).

²⁴ Although, according to Sitney ‘Lye’s experiments in hand-painting film go back to Australia and the mid-1920s’ (2002: 233), his short film, *Colour Box* (1935) was his first proper ‘direct film’. His technique influenced both McLaren, and later, the work of the late American filmmaker Stan Brakhage. See Rees (1999: 28) and Horrocks (2002: 322).

²⁵ McLaren, widely considered one of the most innovative and influential animators in cinema, not only developed Lye’s technique of drawing directly onto film, he also pioneered other developments in animation, including rotoscope, and in his award-winning film *Neighbours* (1952), the process of pixillation, a form of stop-motion animation, in which live actors were photographed in different poses one frame at a time, to produce robotic or puppet-like movements from human subjects. See Rees (1999: 28) and O’Pray (2003: 41-2).

²⁶ The sound equivalent of direct cinema, which worked directly onto a film reel’s optical track.

²⁷ See also Murphy (1989: 36) and Ellis (2000: 83).

²⁸ Cavalcanti ‘gradually assumed Grierson’s role as producer-in-chief for the [GPO Film] unit [after the latter’s retirement in 1937, and] was responsible for many of the important British documentary films of the thirties and forties, such as *North Sea* (Watt, 1938) and *Spare Time* (Jennings, 1939)’ (Bawden, 1976: 116-17). Following this, in 1940, he went to work for Michael Balcon at Ealing studios as a director and advisor. There he directed many notable works, including the features *Went the Day Well* (1942) and *They Made Me a Fugitive* (1947) and the ‘Ventriloquist’s Dummy’ segment of the

sound design,²⁹ brought ‘not only a taste for formal experimentation [...] but [also] a technical know-how [to the movement] that was sorely lacking in Grierson and his [younger collaborators]. [A] great inspirer, he was the force behind such original, non-literal films as *Pett and Pott* [1934], *Coal Face*,³⁰ *Night Mail* [both 1936] and, indirectly, the wartime work of Humphrey Jennings’ (1996: 112). Indeed, the directors of *Night Mail* - Wright and Watt - noted his profound influence on their own work, with the latter even stating that ‘the arrival of Cavalcanti in the GPO film unit was the turning point of British documentary [filmmaking]’³¹ (Macdonald and Cousins, 1996: 113).

The case of *Night Mail* is particularly interesting, as the film, which is rather neatly divided into two halves, explicitly demonstrates the style and influence of Grierson and Cavalcanti respectively. The first half of this documentary about the British postal service, in which the sorting of the mail and its subsequent loading onto the train are meticulously presented - with its use of conventionally ‘realist’ locations scenarios, characters and ‘performances’ by ‘real-life’ postal workers - remains true to Grierson’s social-realist remit, as detailed above. However, the film’s second half, in which the mail train departs and gains speed and momentum contains some of the most notably experimental aspects of the British Documentary Movement. In this sequence, Cavalcanti’s complex sound design, Benjamin Britten’s music and W.H.

portmanteau film *Dead of Night* (1945). See Aitkin (2000)

²⁹ Amongst other things, Cavalcanti oversaw the dubbing of French versions of early Hollywood sound films in the late 1920s and early 1930s. See Bawden (1976: 116-17); Aitkin (2000: 19-22); Macdonald and Cousins (1998: 113-18); and Ellis (2000: 77).

³⁰ Cavalcanti directed both *Pett and Pott* and *Coal Face*. The subtitle of the former alone - ‘A Fairy-Story of the Suburbs’ - serves to separate his work from the dogmatically realist films of Grierson. See Aitkin (2000: 78-81). See also Lovell (1997: 236).

³¹ John Taylor, a cinematographer and later producer within the movement countered this opinion however, stating that Cavalcanti’s *Pett and Pott* (1934, which Taylor shot) was ‘the beginning of the division [in the movement, between those who favoured the input of Grierson and those who looked to Cavalcanti, and] looking back on it, it was a great mistake to have Cavalcanti really, because he didn’t understand what documentary was supposed to be doing’ (Macdonald and Cousins, 1998: 116).

Auden's famous verse narrative³² are skilfully combined into one of the most memorable montages of music, sounds, words and images in British cinema. The film turns into a cine-poem that imbues potentially mundane things - the postal service, the train itself and even an individual letter - with an almost mythic significance.

Night Mail shows both the realist and experimental aspects of the British Documentary Movement at their best.³³ Many of the movement's other films of the time lack this highly successful synthesis of 'social purpose with cinematic experimentation' (Barsam, 1992: 96). However, among the small number of filmmakers working within the movement, who consistently engaged with modernist ideas and experiments was also Humphrey Jennings. In Britain he occupies a space similar to that of Jean Vigo³⁴ in French cinema, as a radical talent and film pioneer who died young and whose great reputation was founded on only a handful of films.³⁵ Jennings, who before his career as a filmmaker, had been one of the organisers, along with André Breton, and others, of the 1936 International Surrealism Exhibition in London and later that year helped to found the Mass Observation Movement with Tom Harrison and Charles Madge, was often regarded with suspicion as an intellectual dilettante by his colleagues within the movement.³⁶ However, his work which combined a surrealist imagination with the more conventional techniques and concerns of documentary realism - in Jennings' case informed by his commitment to Mass Observation, and its 'interest in the collective imagination and its expression' (Winston, 1999: 14) - made him, in the words of Lindsay Anderson, Jennings' most sympathetic and insightful critic, the 'only true poet the British cinema had yet

³² See Bryant (1997: 48-53).

³³ Lovell however, remarks the film features 'an awkward mixture of naturalism and formalism' (Lovell, 1997: 236).

³⁴ See Salles-Gomes (1957: 220-38).

³⁵ See Winston (1999: 7-10); Rattigan (2001: 297-8); and Ellis and McLane (2005: 111).

produced' (1996: 87),³⁷ and, next to Michael Powell, the most influential British filmmaker on his native art cinema. Indeed, Erik Hedling notes that the 'internationally acclaimed British art cinema of the 1980s and early 1990s [has] its roots in 1960s film culture, which in turn could be referred back to the 1940s and in particular to Powell and Pressburger and Humphrey Jennings' (Hedling, 1997: 184-5).

Jennings and Powell and Pressburger.

Jennings' place in the British Documentary Movement, like that of Lye, McLaren and Cavalcanti, was that of an outsider, whose more experimental work was regarded with a certain amount of suspicion by those of his contemporaries conforming to the 'Grierson school' of filmmaking. For example, his second film for the unit,³⁸ *Spare Time* (1938), which examined the leisure activities of the working classes, was criticized within the Movement for satirising its subjects and 'making no attempt to idealise the working class or to take a didactic stance' (Bawden, 1976: 367). While the charge of satirising the working class is somewhat unjust, and Jennings' images and the voice-over by the writer Laurie Lee together treat their subjects in a warm and humanistic way, the charge of failing to take a didactic stance is entirely justified. Jennings', unlike the majority of his contemporaries in the British Documentary Movement, was reluctant to 'preach' his ideological position in the manner of Grierson. Rather, films such as *Spare Time* grew out of his work with

³⁶ See Nowell-Smith (1986: 321-33).

³⁷ Anderson's seminal article, 'Only Connect: Some Aspects of the Work of Humphrey Jennings' first appeared in *Sight and Sound* vol 23, no. 4: Spring 1954.

³⁸ His first, *Post Haste* (1934) was another experimental work, and 'possibly the first film to be composed entirely of prints and drawings' (Bawden, 1976: 367). He left the Unit soon after this film to continue his work with Mass Observation and to help organise the 1936 Surrealism Exhibition. See Nowell-Smith (1986: 321-33)

Mass Observation, 'which made close records of the day-to-day activities of ordinary people' (Bawden, 1976: 367), and was interested in the objective relaying of facts and information, without ideological interference. In this way, Jennings' film comes closer to the modern conception of the documentary, in that it structures itself around a series of objectively filmed 'real' observations, rather than the more subjective model of carefully shooting a pre-determined script that is supposed to reflect reality.

Jennings' most fertile period was during the Second World War.³⁹ The war-time films he made for the Crown Film Unit⁴⁰ show Jennings to be an innovative documentary filmmaker and propagandist worthy of comparison to Leni Riefenstahl.⁴¹ His films may not be art films in the modernist tradition set out in the previous chapter, but his finest works, such as *Listen to Britain* (1942), *Fires Were Started* (1943) and *A Diary for Timothy* (1945), are still works of 'the utmost complexity' (Winston, 1999: 74), that were neither ambivalent nor suspicious about art in the way that many films made under Grierson's guidance were.⁴² *A Diary for Timothy*,⁴³ for example, like *Night Mail* before it, employs a memorable narration by one of Britain's leading writers of the period, E.M. Forster. The film begins with the birth of a child, Timothy Jenkins, in 1944 - exactly five years after the start of the war - and the narrator (Michael Redgrave) ponders both the child's future and the events of the last year of the war as seen through the eyes of four characters: a wounded fighter pilot, a coal miner, a farmer and a train driver, who each fight the war on their own

³⁹ See Rattigan (2001: 287-309).

⁴⁰ The Crown Film Unit was formed in 1940 as a subsidiary of the Ministry of Information, and was responsible for war-time propaganda.

⁴¹ The German filmmaker, whose works *The Triumph of the Will* (1934) and *Olympia* (1938), made her, despite her subsequent protestations, the key Nazi filmmaker. She 'masterfully fed the German population an image of themselves, their history and their destiny, that reinforced the power of the state and the idolisation of the Führer' (Macdonald and Cousins, 1998: 126). See also Downing (1992: 16-26); Malcolm (2000: 108-9); and Cousins (2004: 153-4).

⁴² It is worth noting that the majority of Jennings' films were made after Grierson's retirement from the GPO Film Unit.

'battlefront'. However, the film's focus stretches far beyond these characters and such incidents as an accident in the coalmine or the pilot's gradual recovery. Rather, Jennings' film 'ranges freely over the life of the nation [through] continuously striking associations of image, sound, music and comment' (Winston, 1999: 74) which simultaneously juxtapose and bring together aspects of war-time British life and culture.⁴⁴ For example, Forster's narration tells of Timothy's good fortune at being born into the comfort of a middle-class family in suburban Oxfordshire, but Jennings' images counter this idyllic setting with the squalor of the Welsh coal mining village and the rubble of London during the Blitz. The film thus draws Timothy's and the viewer's attention towards the diversity of the nation and how the different contributions of individual people - as a either a coal miner or, in the case of Timothy's father, a soldier - are equally important in pulling the nation together at its time of need. This is further emphasised in Jennings' juxtaposition of high (Dame Myra Hess playing Beethoven's 'Appassionata' Sonata and John Gielgud playing Hamlet) and low (music hall performances) culture. There is nothing patronising nor elitist about the presentation of these disparate cultural traditions. For example, the audience at the Hess' piano recital presents 'types' from all classes - officers and enlisted men, factory workers and women in evening gowns - and, as Dean Duncan notes:

[i]n this setting, classical music, that great separator and traditional emblem of high/low hierarchies, stands in for all of the miraculous reconciliations that the war has brought about. For a brief moment we find common aspiration.

⁴³ See Anderson (1996: 93).

⁴⁴ See Rattigan (2001: 299-301).

mutual accomplishment, and a depth of feeling that, however glancingly, binds up the wounds of the conflict (Duncan, 2002: 6-7)⁴⁵

Music, and sound in general, is central to Jennings' work. *Listen to Britain*, for example, as the title suggests, is a film dominated by its soundtrack.⁴⁶ Visually, the film is a tightly constructed eighteen-minute montage of images recorded over the course of the first year of the Blitz. As Anderson notes, the film 'dispenses with commentary altogether' (1996: 90) and instead takes the form of a 'non-narrative montage of images and sounds' (Wymer, 2005: 114), in which 'natural sounds, popular songs, and classical music, as well as snatches of 'over-heard' conversation skilfully complement the film's visuals' (Bawden, 1976: 421). *Listen to Britain* could not be further removed from the 'Grierson school' of the British Documentary Movement. Rather, in the sometimes surreal juxtaposition of images and experimentation with sound, the film betrays the influence of Cavalcanti's contributions to the movement. Its careful arrangement of 'observational' footage bears comparison not only with Cavalcanti's earlier *Rien que les Heures*, but also with the definitive modernist 'city' film of the late 1920s, Vertov's *The Man with a Movie Camera* (1929).⁴⁷ The comparison with Vertov is particularly apt, for the Russian filmmaker's work was the embodiment of the kind of modernist experimentation that Grierson and his like-minded followers saw as elitist and alienating in both European cinema and in the work of Jennings himself. However, it is these experimental impulses in Jennings' work, which Grierson viewed with great suspicion, that have

⁴⁵ The irony of using Beethoven to bring the nation together was not lost on Jennings or Forster. The voiceover states: '[d]id you like the music the lady was playing [Timothy]? Some of us think it is the greatest music in the world. Yet it is German music, and we're fighting the Germans. There's something you will have to think over later on'.

⁴⁶ See Kinder and Houston (1972: 119-22)

ironically allowed Jennings alone ‘among [...] his fellows in the British Documentary Movement [to have a reputation that] remains unsullied and unrevised’ (Winston, 1999: 7).

Perhaps the most distinguishing quality of Jennings’ work is its influence on contemporary British art cinema, which extends, at times, even to the work of Jarman and Greenaway, who are highly critical of the British realist tradition and whose own work is often directly at odds with it. In Jarman’s *The Last of England*, for example, the combination of the imagistic qualities of silent cinema with a complex sound design and inventive use of music clearly echoes *Listen to Britain*.⁴⁸ More ironically, Greenaway began his filmmaking career as an editor at the Central Office of Information, ‘an inheritor of Grierson’s GPO film unit’ (Street: 1997: 178), where Jennings had worked during the war. In his early short films, such as *A Walk Through H* and *Vertical Features Remake*, despite his protestations that they do not ‘tap into the British film traditions of Grierson, Cavalcanti and Jennings’ (Hacker and Price, 1991: 212), Greenaway actually shows a fascination, albeit a half mocking one, with the form and aesthetics of the British documentary tradition. Furthermore, in their rejection of the conventional narratives, scripts and characters of the Griersonian model, and in the slightly surreal wit of both the visuals and voice-overs, these films bear comparison, quite unironically, to the documentaries of Jennings.⁴⁹

It is perhaps Davies’ work that most profoundly displays the influence of Jennings, however. This is particularly notable in Davies’ handling of sound and music in his films, which echo Jennings’ experiments with the sound design. For

⁴⁷ See Vertov (1984) and O’Pray (2003: 32-7).

⁴⁸ See Kuhn (1995: 104-21); Hill (1999: 157) and Wymer (2005: 113-4).

⁴⁹ Hacker and Price, pace Greenaway, make reference to Anderson’s view that ‘Jennings was a ‘poetic’ not a ‘realist’ filmmaker’ (1991: 212) and therefore somewhat removed from the British filmmaking tradition Greenaway seeks to distance himself from. See also Street (1997: 178) and Andrews (2000:

example, the numerous communal sing-a-longs of Davies' *Distant Voices, Still Lives* deliberately echo those in *Listen to Britain*.⁵⁰ Davies even 'borrows' the opening sounds of the earlier film - the famous 'four pips' that introduce the BBC World Service - for the introduction to his own.⁵¹ His work, like that of Jennings, seeks to combine modernist techniques and experiments with the aesthetics and concerns of British social realism. Therefore, unlike the linear narratives of British documentaries such as *Night Mail* or conventional social-realist features such as Loach's *Kes*, Davies' films share with many of Jennings', an 'allusive, non-narrative style' (Bawden, 1976: 367).

If Jennings' films were in many ways atypical of the British Documentary Movement, many British filmmakers during and immediately after the Second World War reacted far more violently against the dominance of realism over British cinema. In his rather short examination of British cinema in *A Short History of the Movies*, Gerald Mast writes that between the end of the Second World War and 1960, British cinema seemed

synonymous with four cinematically conventional, although carefully crafted genres. First, there were the [...] adaptations of literary classics [...] Second, there were the suspenseful mystery thrillers [...] of war time assignments or post-war political cabals. Third, there were the [...] 'little' comedies made at Ealing Studios [...] And fourth, there were the ballet spectacles of Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger. [And] the general traits of all four of these British genres were a subtle understatement, expert acting, carefully realistic

3-5).

⁵⁰ For example, the scene where Tony and his fellow soldiers sing 'It Takes a Worried Man to Sing A

décor, and, a firm control of taut narrative construction (Mast, 1995: 344-5).

This statement, while partly true, also represents a gross misrepresentation and misreading of British cinema of the time, which ‘could be said to have achieved a genuinely indigenous school of filmmaking’ (Bawden, 1976: 303), not only in the form of the British Documentary Movement, but also in much of the work Mast alludes to above. Mast fails to realise that the end of the war also signaled the end of both the British Documentary Movement’s, and - at least temporarily - realism’s dominance over British cinema. Rather, ‘[t]he war years saw a revival in English romanticism [typified by the work of many of these filmmakers, that grew] in response to the need for an idealised reaffirmation of British history [and] for release into fantasy and dream to relieve the stress, hardship and agony of war’ (Wollen, 1993: 41). This ‘new romanticism’, as ‘the parallel movement in painting and poetry is called’ (Wollen, 1993: 41), rarely exhibited the subtle understatement and realistic décor Mast sees. Instead, the majority of new-romantic films can be characterised in direct opposition to the traditional qualities of British cinema. New-romantic films viewed the artist as visionary, were aesthetically flamboyant, opulent and often colourful rather than visually austere or conservative, displayed an emphasis on emotion as opposed to the serious social and educational concerns of the British Documentary Movement and the restraint of mainstream British cinema, and, perhaps most importantly, new-romantic films were fantastic and imaginative rather than realistic.

Wollen in fact notes that few British film of the time were even ‘remotely

Worried Song’ on a train, directly recalls a scene in Jennings’ film where soldiers sing the same song.

⁵¹ See Davies (1992: 75).

‘realist’ (1993: 41). For example, Olivier’s *Henry V* (1944), Lean’s *Blithe Spirit* (1945) and Thorold Dickinson’s⁵² *Men of Two Worlds* (1946) were all shot in Technicolor, and feature purposely ‘unrealistic’, stage-bound sets and, in the case of *Blithe Spirit*, a plot centred on a supernatural theme. Other films, such as Reed’s *Odd Man Out* (1947) and *The Third Man* (1949) and Lean’s *Great Expectations* (1946) although shot in black-and-white, are equally aesthetically-minded works, and feature notably expressionist camera work, such as the camera angles of *The Third Man*, and stylised imagery such as the scenes on the Medway saltings in *Great Expectations*, that bear no relation to the often dour images and cinematic style of British social realism.⁵³

Most significant however, was the ‘deviant, non-realist British cinema’ (Street: 1997: 149) of Powell and Pressburger. These two filmmakers, who had first worked together on *The Spy in Black* for producer Alexander Korda in 1939,⁵⁴ went on to form one of the most significant collaborations in British cinema. During their creative peak between 1943 and 1951, the Archers wrote, directed and produced ten films⁵⁵ that now stand as some of the most respected and influential British films to date.⁵⁶ However, their work was greatly misunderstood at the time of its release, and

⁵² Dickinson made only ten films between 1937 and 1958, including *The Arsenal Stadium Mystery* (1939), *Gaslight* (1940), *Men of Two Worlds* (1946) and *Secret People* (1952). Roy Armes, however notes that he, along with Powell, is one of the two filmmakers who ‘stand aside from the predominant trends of the 1940s and early 1950s [and] despite [...] strong stylistic differences, Powell and Dickinson are united in their rejection of the naturalistic aesthetic which might have developed from their wartime propaganda work in semi-documentary style’ (1978: 216-7). Dickinson would incidentally go on to teach a course on World Cinema at the Slade where Derek Jarman was one of his pupils. See Peake (1999: 112-3) and Wymer (2005: 22).

⁵³ See Ellis (1996: 69-73).

⁵⁴ See Powell (1986: 287-309) and Street (1997: 161).

⁵⁵ These films were: *The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp* (1943), *A Canterbury Tale* (1944), *I Know Where I’m Going* (1945), *A Matter of Life and Death* (1946), *Black Narcissus* (1947), *The Red Shoes* (1948), *The Small Back Room* (1949), *The Elusive Pimpernel* (1950), *Gone to Earth* (1950) and *The Tales of Hoffman* (1951).

⁵⁶ For example, *A Matter of Life and Death*, *The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp*, *Black Narcissus* and *The Red Shoes* were all voted amongst the 100 best films of the century in *Time Out* magazine’s poll of ‘international directors, producers, actors, programmers and critics’ (Pym, 2002: x-xi).

often left mainstream critics, audiences and even their own producers baffled.

Subsequently many of their finest works were neglected and heavily cut and altered for overseas distribution.⁵⁷ More recently however, ‘as critical taste [in Britain] has moved away from realism, Powell and Pressburger have been reclaimed as the jewel in the crown of British cinema’ (Caugie and Rockett, 1996: 128). While perhaps lacking the psychological and existential themes of most European art films, I shall demonstrate that their work bears the hallmarks of art cinema in their ‘auteurism and high art ambitions’ (O’Pray, 1996 (c): 190). Indeed, British filmmakers such as Ken Russell, Derek Jarman, Terence Davies, Sally Potter, view Powell and Pressburger as the central figures in the development art cinema in Britain.⁵⁸

Despite Mast’s assertion that their ‘ballet spectacles’ were films of ‘subtle understatement’ with ‘realistic décor’, their films were in fact ‘profoundly romantic in [their] impulses’ (McElhaney, 1997: 368) and frequently accused of ‘bad taste’ and ‘excess’ (O’Pray, 1996 (b): 182). Their films displayed an obvious ‘fascination with the mystical and the fantastic’ (McElhaney, 1997: 368). Indeed, Powell had been one of the principal directors on Korda’s *The Thief of Baghdad* (1940),⁵⁹ arguably the defining film of this short-lived ‘New Romantic’ movement,⁶⁰ and one of the key ‘fantasy’ films in world cinema. Described by Leslie Halliwell ‘as the only film to

⁵⁷ Street notes for example, that while *A Canterbury Tale* (1944) is ‘now regarded as one of their best films [...] it suffered from studio cuts to make it more comprehensible in terms of narrative’ (1997: 161).

⁵⁸ Petit, for example, argued that Powell was the ‘only’ British filmmaker (BFI archives, *Radio On*, box 1). See also Jarman (1984: 216). Equally, with filmmakers as diverse as Martin Scorsese, Francis Ford Coppola, John Boorman and Aki Kaurismäki citing their work as an influence on their own, the international reputation of Powell and Pressburger has been rescued. See for example, Lazar (2003: xi).

⁵⁹ Powell is credited as co-director with Ludwig Burger and Tim Whelan. The art-director William Cameron Menzies, Zoltan Korda and Alexander Korda himself also contributed uncredited direction.

⁶⁰ In addition to Powell, Korda assembled some of the key talents that would champion the ‘new-romantic’ style of British filmmaking over the following decade, including the special-effects artist Lawrence Butler and the cinematographer George Périnal, who lit such films of the first wave of European modernism as Jacques Feyder’s *Les Nouveaux Messieurs* (1929), Cocteau’s *Le Sang D’un*

catch on celluloid the overpowering atmosphere of the *Arabian Nights*' (Walker, 1999: 827), the film's Middle-Eastern setting, fairy-tale plot and fantastic elements show a disengagement with contemporary social issues, Britain, and above all, reality, that certainly qualify it as escapist. However, while *The Thief of Baghdad* and many other British new-romantic films did not look down upon the idea of cinema as an medium for providing entertainment and escapism,⁶¹ they still distinguish themselves from the majority of Hollywood films by virtue of their makers' romantic inclination towards aestheticism. This encouraged them to experiment with new techniques and to explore the visual possibilities of cinema.⁶² George Périnal's use of Technicolor and the vast array of special effects that Ludwig Butler combined to realise the key fantastic elements of the film were unsurpassed at the time.⁶³ Powell never again worked on a film quite as fantastical, but the qualities that set *The Thief of Baghdad* apart from all other British films of the time would characterise the best of his subsequent work with Pressburger.

The films made by the Archers go far beyond the 'ballet spectacles' - such as *The Red Shoes* and *Tales of Hoffman* - that Mast describes, and rather represent an eclectic, even eccentric, blend of film genres and styles. For example, films such as the *49th Parallel* (1941), *A Canterbury Tale* (1944) and *A Matter of Life and Death* (1946) were all works of war-time propaganda, designed to encourage and commemorate the Anglo-American alliance, yet they are very different in terms of style and tone. The first is a somewhat conventional men-on-the-run film, similar to

Poète (1930) and Clair's *A Nous la Liberté* (1931), before being invited to work in England by Korda. See Bawden (1976: 543-4) and Arnes (1978: 219).

⁶¹ According to Ellis, Grierson himself claimed to have 'invented the very word "escapism", as a stick with which to beat his old friend [Robert Flaherty]' (2000: 107) for moving away from the realism of his earlier work towards exoticism and sentimentality.

⁶² *The Thief of Baghdad*, although begun at Pinewood studios, had to be finished in Hollywood due to the Blitz.

both *Odd Man Out* and *They Made Me A Fugitive*. *A Canterbury Tale* and especially *A Matter of Life and Death*, in contrast, were increasingly eccentric and original productions more typical of the Archers' work. The narrative of the latter, for example, centres on a British pilot seriously injured in a plane crash who hovers between life and death while his fate is decided by a trial in heaven. The film combines this fantastical narrative with aspects of melodrama, romantic comedy and a serious examination of the bereavement caused by war.

The film is also notable for its cinematography (by Jack Cardiff), which alternates between monochrome⁶⁴ and colour, with the former being used for the scenes set in heaven and the latter for those set on earth. As Geoff Andrew notes, this inversion of the idea that black-and-white photography was more suited to the depiction of 'realism' than colour - as in Victor Fleming's *The Wizard of Oz* (1939), in which the dour black-and-white reality of Kansas is contrasted with the luminous colour of the fantastical land of 'Oz' - suggests that 'Powell [was] slyly asserting, in the faces of the British documentary boys, the greater reality of that which is imagined' (Andrew, 2002 (f): 738-9). This was further emphasized by Powell and Pressburger's decision to shoot their subsequent film, *Black Narcissus*, in which a group of Anglican nuns attempt to set up a Christian community in the Himalayas, at Denham studios, rather than on location in India, despite Korda's offer to fund the latter. The film almost entirely eschewed conventional notions of *verisimilitude* and instead flaunted the painted Himalayan backdrops of Alfred Junge's⁶⁵ production

⁶³ Including, for example, stop-motion animation, miniature and model work, and blue-screen.

⁶⁴ Monochrome implies shooting on Technicolor film but draining the image of its colour, rather than shooting on conventional black-and-white film stock.

⁶⁵ Junge, who designed *The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp*, *A Canterbury Tale* and *A Matter of Life and Death* as well as *Black Narcissus*, was born in Germany in 1886. He was one of many Europeans, including Périnal, set and costume designer Hein Heckroth, the actor Anton Walbrook and the Hungarian-born Pressburger to work with the Archers' during their heyday. The prevalence of

design to create an India that existed in the mind, rather than reality.⁶⁶

Indeed, the Archers did not look favourably upon the British social realist tradition and ‘Powell comment[ed] frequently on his aversion to documentary filmmaking and his sense that the use and idea of naturalism [was] overrated and, in fact, frequently deaden[ed] ideological impulses’ (Lazlar, 2003: xiv). This is one respect in which the work of Powell and Pressburger has had a great effect on British art cinema, for they, as the strongest, most prolific and most committed exponents of British new romanticism have become the fathers of its anti-realist tradition. Russell, for example, regards the Archers’ first ballet film, *The Red Shoes*, as ‘the first art film in the history of the British Cinema’ (Russell, 1991: 34). The film, like the majority of Powell and Pressburger’s work, does not display any particular modernist impulses. Indeed, the plot is a rather conventional backstage melodrama. However, its virtuoso camera-work, colour-coded cinematography, and the ‘Red Shoes’ ballet itself, specially written for the film by Brian Easdale, were indeed ‘like nothing [...] British cinema ha[d] ever seen’ (Rayns: 2002 (e): 914). The film’s production design - which built on the ‘plastic’ qualities of films such as *A Matter of Life and Death* and *Black Narcissus*, with their self-consciously artificial *mis-en-scène* and studio sets that made little or no attempt to mirror material reality - anticipate works of British art cinema such as Jarman’s *Caravaggio* and Greenaway’s *The Cook, The Thief, His Wife and Her Lover* as well as international art films such as *Fellini’s Casanova* (1976) and Hans Jürgen Syberberg’s film of Wagner’s *Parsifal* (1982).

Powell and Pressburger’s films are also notable for their ‘cinematic’ qualities, both in terms of technique and content, and their *auteurist* view of filmmaking.

European talent both in front of and behind the camera in their films is yet another way in which they prefigured the films of contemporary British art filmmakers. See Street (1997: 161).

Powell had a strong and distinctive visual sense that was rare in British cinema at the time. He regarded himself as 'a technical filmmaker' (Powell: 1986: 48), who was interested in experimenting with the form and vocabularies of the medium. And although they insisted upon sharing credit in a distinctly anti-*auteurist* manner, the technical skill, preference for original rather than adapted material and consistency of themes that characterize Powell and Pressburger's work, make them rare examples of *auteurs* in British film.⁶⁷ Much the same could be said of many contemporary British art filmmakers, including Russell, Roeg, Jarman, Greenaway, Davies and Potter, whose work emphasizes aestheticism and directorial authorship over the literary and social concerns of most non-mainstream British cinema. Furthermore, unlike many of their other contemporaries, including Jennings, who always remained somewhat suspicious of cinema and regarded it as inferior to the older arts,⁶⁸ both Powell and Pressburger were cineastes who were fascinated by questioning and examining the meaning and construction of cinema itself. Indeed, as John McElhaney remarks:

Powell-Pressburger films repeatedly address issues which strike at the heart of the nature of cinema itself: What is the relationship between realism and artifice? What are the cinema's ties to theatre, painting and music? What connections are there between this most contemporary and technological of art forms and the oldest forms of narrative? (McElhaney, 1997: 368).

McElhaney's insightful description of the films of Powell and Pressburger could equally be applied to Jarman, Greenaway and others working in contemporary British

⁶⁶ See Powell (1986: 584-5).

⁶⁷ See Lanza (1989: 20)

art cinema. It shows just how influential and ahead of their time the Archers were. The self-reflexivity of films such as *A Matter of Life and Death* and *The Red Shoes*, which 'laid bare the devices' of filmmaking and emphasized the artificial construction of the medium, represent their most significant engagements with modernism and European art cinema. At a time when European art cinema was defined by the more aesthetically conservative work of Italian *neo-realism*, the self-reflexivity work of Powell and Pressburger forges a link between early, pre-war modernist works of filmmakers such as Murnau and Rene Clair and later works of neo-modern and post-modern art cinema including Fellini's *Satyricon* (1969), Russell's *Mahler* (1974) and *The Draughtsman's Contract*.

Powell's most complex examination of the nature of cinema, *Peeping Tom* (1959), was also his most significant film without Pressburger.⁶⁹ A psychological horror film with a sophistication and artistry comparable to Franju's *Les Yeux sans Visage*, released earlier in 1959, and Hitchcock's *Psycho* released just after in 1960. *Peeping Tom* is the story of a serial killer, psychologically tortured as a boy as part of his scientist father's investigation of fear. The film seeks to explore the very substance of film as a medium. Not only is Mark, the murderous protagonist, an aspiring filmmaker who works as a focus puller at a London film studio, he also films and repeatedly screens the murders of his victims, as well as footage of himself as a child, shot by his father during his experiments into fear.⁷⁰

Armes notes that *Peeping Tom* incorporates 'elements of film-within-a-film with a complexity worthy of Alain Resnais' *Night and Fog* [1955]' (1978: 227).

⁶⁸ See Winston (1999: 10).

⁶⁹ The film was written by Leo Marks. According to Powell, however, the two worked 'together in the way [he had] always worked with Pressburger' (Tavernier, 2003: 26).

⁷⁰ Powell added another layer of self-reflexivity to the film by playing the father himself and the protagonist's name, Mark Lewis, is an inversion of that of writer Leo Marks. See Armes (1978: 228).

Indeed, as in a film by Resnais, Godard or Greenaway, one cannot watch *Peeping Tom* without being aware that one is watching a film. Powell's direction continually draws attention to the process of filmmaking. He not only edits the film with 'an elaborate structure alternating black and white and colour, 35mm and 16mm' (Armes, 1978: 226), he also frames the murders through the viewfinder of Mark's 16mm camera and has Mark try to film Helen, his neighbour, as she watches his father's 'home movies'. This implicates the viewer in these crimes and making one contemplate the essentially exploitive and voyeuristic nature of cinema for both the maker and the audience. Powell, and the writer, Leo Marks, even went so far as to offer a deconstruction of their own film when Helen insists that Mark explain the home movies to her, as she would 'like to understand what [she is] shown' (Marks, 1998: 44).

However, in a manner typical of Powell's work, there was an almost unanimous outcry from the British press upon the film's release, damning it as sick, vile and pornographic.⁷¹ David Robinson in *Monthly Film Bulletin* made an explicit comparison between the film and the Marquis De Sade's *120 Days of Sodom* (see Christie, 1978: 56). Ian Christie, Powell's biographer, notes that the film's reception 'virtually ended Powell's career as a major director in Britain and, in retrospect, it can be seen as inaugurating the era of naturalistic "realism" that dominated the early 1960s' (Christie, 1978: 53). The first half of Christie's statement is impossible to deny: Powell directed only a handful of shorts and features over the three decades between *Peeping Tom* and his death in 1990, none of which he made in England. The second half of his statement, however, seems unwarranted. *Peeping Tom*, should perhaps be viewed as Powell's final transgression of the dominant trends of British cinema and the one film of the early 1960s 'which had nothing to do with kitchen

sinks or working-class tragedies [and] which struggled single-handed to drag the British cinema into the present tense' (Rayns, 2002 (c): 888). With the advent of 'Free Cinema' and the release of feature films such as Jack Clayton's *Room at the Top* and Tony Richardson's *Look Back in Anger* in 1959, the revival of realism in British cinema was already under way upon the film's release. Thus while the failure of *Peeping Tom* may have helped to discourage other filmmakers of the time from deviating from this realist course, it was not a contributing factor to inaugurating the social realism of the 1960s. Rather, it may be closer to the truth to say that the films Powell made in the 1940s and early 1950s with Pressburger, which came to typify the mood of new romanticism that flourished in Britain during and immediately after the war, 'partly explained the success of the Angry Young Men films in the next decade' (Wollen, 1993: 41).⁷²

Free Cinema and The British 'New Wave'.

After the brief dominance of 'New Romanticism' British cinema somewhat lost its way by the start of the 1950s.⁷³ By 1951 Powell and Pressburger made their last great film together, *Tales of Hoffman*, based on Offenbach's operetta. Ealing studios similarly went into decline after 1951, the year of both Charles Crichton's *The Lavender Hill Mob* and Alexander Mackendrick's *The Man in the White Suit*, and would produce only one more genuinely great film before their sale to the BBC in

⁷¹ See Ellis (1996: 72).

⁷² See also Lowenstein (2000: 221-232).

⁷³ As Aldgate and Richards note, British critics 'have seen the period from 1951 to 1958 as one of "complacency and inertia", as "extraordinarily dead" [and] a "doldrums era"' (2002: 153). However, recent critical reappraisals of British cinema in the period include Harper and Porter (2003) and MacKillop and Sinyard (2003).

1955, Mackendrick's *The Ladykillers*, made earlier that year.⁷⁴ The British Documentary Movement was also in its final stages of decline. Jennings had died in 1950 aged 43, while scouting film location on the Greek Island of Poros, and many of its other radical figures were working abroad.⁷⁵ Of course, British cinema continued, as always, to produce some notable and popular literary adaptations, but even these showed signs of fatigue compared with such films of the 1940s as David Lean's *Great Expectations* (1946) and *Oliver Twist* (1948). Olivier, for example, after the promise displayed as a film director in *Henry V* (1944) and *Hamlet* (1948), made only two films in the 1950s, his rather stagy version of *Richard III* (1955) and the leaden comedy, *The Prince and the Showgirl* (1957), based on Terence Rattigan's play. Anthony Asquith,⁷⁶ 'the grand-master of the filmed English classic' (Brown, 2002: 547), contributed the overly talky *The Browning Version* (1951), again from a play by Rattigan,⁷⁷ and *The Importance of Being Earnest* (1952) which is more a record of an immaculately acted theatrical performance of Wilde's play than a film adaptation.⁷⁸

Social realism continued, albeit in a somewhat compromised form - dictated by contemporary standards of decency and commercial necessity - in the so-called 'social problem' films,⁷⁹ including those of the producer/director team of Michael Relph and Basil Dearden. These films, beginning with *The Blue Lamp* (1949), (the film which gave birth to 'Dixon of Dock Green'), and moving through *Violent Playground* (1958), *Sapphire* (1959), *Victim* (1961) and *A Place to Go* (1963), dealt

⁷⁴ See Aldgate and Richards (2002: 149) and Harper and Porter (2003: 57-73).

⁷⁵ Cavalcanti had returned to his native Brazil and founded the Brazilian Film Institute; Len Lye had moved to America where he soon gave up filmmaking in favour of painting and sculpture (Caughie and Rockett, 1996: 106); McLaren, a pacifist, had emigrated to America at the start of the war and had accepted Grierson's invitation to become the head of animation at the National Film Board of Canada in 1941 where he enjoyed several decades of government support for his filmmaking experiments.

⁷⁶ See Arnes (1978: 198-202).

⁷⁷ See Shellard (2003: 190-204).

⁷⁸ See Walker (1999: 412).

⁷⁹ See Hill (1986: 97-127) and Street (1997: 78-9).

with issues such as crime, delinquency, race and closeted homosexuality with sincerity and as much frankness as was permissible at the time. It also continued in films by J. Lee Thompson such as *Yield to the Night* (1956),⁸⁰ a loose dramatisation of the Ruth Ellis case with a decidedly anti-capital punishment stance and *Woman in a Dressing Gown* (1957),⁸¹ which provides ‘[p]roof that the kitchen sink was not [sic] invented in the 1960s’ (Charity, 2002 (f): 1304). Otherwise, British cinema ‘was reliving the epic deeds of World War Two’ (Aldgate and Richards: 2002: 153)⁸² and giving rise to more escapist mainstream entertainments such as Hammer Horror films,⁸³ the cycle of ‘Doctor’ films⁸⁴ starring Dirk Bogarde before he reinvented himself as the foremost British actor in European art cinema, the earliest ‘Carry On’ films,⁸⁵ Bond films⁸⁶ and the series of films starring Dame Margaret Rutherford as Agatha Christie’s Miss Marple⁸⁷. However, the period also gave rise, perhaps inadvertently, to ‘Free Cinema’, which grew out of opposition to these then current

⁸⁰ See Chibnall (2000: 70-98) and Williams (2003: 130-3).

⁸¹ See Chibnall (2000: 144-58) and Williams (2003: 143-154).

⁸² In films such as Jack Lee’s *The Wooden Horse* (1950), Charles Friend’s *The Cruel Sea* (1953), Guy Hamilton’s *The Colditz Story* (1954) and Ralph Thomas’ *Above Us the Waves* (1955). See Rattigan (1994: 143-54).

⁸³ A series of commercial and often low-budget horror and exploitation films made at Sir James Carreras’ Hammer Studio at Bray. The studio’s commitment to horror began with the success of *The Quatermass Experiment* (1955) and continued through Terence Fisher’s *The Curse of Frankenstein* (1957) and *Dracula* (1958) and seemingly endless variations on the two stories. The films remained watchable due to the unfaltering professionalism of Peter Cushing’s and Christopher Lee’s performances. See also Sanjek (1994: 195-210); Street (1997: 95-7); Conrich, (1997: 226-234) and Harper and Porter (2003: 137-52).

⁸⁴ The series, in which Bogarde played Dr Simon Sparrow, included *Doctor in the House* (1954), *Doctor at Sea* (1955), *Doctor at Large* (1957), and *Doctor in Distress* (1963), as well as three sequels without Bogarde, *Doctor in Love* (1960), *Doctor in Clover* (1966), *Doctor in Trouble* (1970) and a television spin-off.

⁸⁵ The series began with *Carry on Sergeant* (1958), *Carry on Nurse* (1959), *Carry on Constable* (1960) and *Carry on Regardless* (1961) and continued at an alarmingly prolific rate through the 1960s and more sporadically in the 1970s until *Carry on Emmanuelle* (1978) effectively ended the series. See Jordan (1983: 312-27) and Dacre (1997: 198-206).

⁸⁶ ‘The most commercially successful series of films in post-war British cinema’ (Caughie and Rockett, 1996: 31), though made entirely with American money. The adaptations of Ian Fleming’s James Bond novels began with *Dr No* (1962), *From Russia with Love* (1963) and *Goldfinger* (1964). See Woollacott (1983: 208-225).

⁸⁷ The first, *Murder She Said* (1961), was popular enough to be followed by four sequels: *Murder at the Gallop* (1963), *Murder Most Foul* (1964), *Murder Ahoy!* (1965) and *The Alphabet Murders* (1965).

trends in British cinema and sought to revitalise what was seen by many as a stagnant film industry.

On one level, the term 'Free Cinema' refers to six screenings of films at the National Film Theatre between 1956 and 1959.⁸⁸ The programmes were in part selected by Anderson, Gavin Lambert, the then editors of the Oxford-based film journal *Sequence*, and Reisz, one of the journal's more frequent contributors.⁸⁹ At first, the programs mainly consisted of documentaries, including established, but perhaps little seen works, such as Georges Franju's *Le Sang des Bêtes* (1949), the noted surrealist's infamous film describing three Parisian abattoirs, and more contemporary works such as Claude Goretta and Alan Tanner's *Nice Time* (1957), an impression of the nightlife around Piccadilly Circus, made by two Frenchmen, yet funded by the British Film Institute.⁹⁰ Also, there were screenings of radical animated works such as McLaren's *Neighbours*, and Jan Lenica and Walerian Borowczyk's *Once Upon a Time* (1958). In the later programs however, some fictional shorts and features were screened including Roman Polanski's *Two Men and a Wardrobe* (1958), Truffaut's debut short *Les Mistons* (1957) and Claude Chabrol's *Le Beau Serge* (1957), the first official feature of the French *nouvelle vague*. However, the phrase 'Free Cinema' also refers to the specific collection of oppositional British documentary films screened alongside those listed above.⁹¹ Inspired equally by the legacy of the British Documentary Movement, Italian *neo-realism*, and contemporary British writings of John Osborne, John Braine, Alan Sillitoe, Shelagh Delaney and others, British 'Free Cinema' was so named as it represented a newfound freedom of expression in making films that were highly personal and liberated from the

⁸⁸ See Ellis (1977: 29-31) and Hedling (1998: 41).

⁸⁹ See Hedling (1998: 8-25) and (2003: 23-34).

constraints of commercial considerations. These films included Lindsay Anderson's *The Wakefield Express* (1952), *O Dreamland* (1953) and *Every Day Except Christmas* (1957); Reisz's *We Are the Lambeth Boys*, and Reisz's and Richardson's collaboration *Mama Don't Allow* (1956).⁹²

If the films of these young British directors did not always compare favourably with those of some of their international counterparts, particularly such radical experiments as *Neighbours* and *Le Sang des Bêtes*, the films of Free Cinema would remain significant works in the development of British cinema if only for their serving as a training ground for the feature films Anderson, Reisz and Richardson would make in the early 1960s that formed the backbone of the British 'New Wave'.

Richardson was the first of the three to receive serious critical attention, albeit as a theatre director. In 1955 he had formed the English Stage Company with George Devine at the Royal Court Theatre, where in 1956 Richardson's production of John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger* was running at the same time as his film, *Mama Don't Allow* was shown at the National Film Theatre during the first Free Cinema program.⁹³ As Caughie and Rockett have noted, it was this production, 'or at least Kenneth Tynan's review of it, which set the theatre "new wave" in motion and gave birth to the "angry young men"' (Caughie and Rockett, 1996: 137-8).

The 'New Wave' of British cinema was a marriage of Free Cinema and this literary movement, with directors such as Richardson, Reisz, Anderson and John Schlesinger⁹⁴ adapting the literary works of Osborne, Alan Sillitoe, Shelagh Delaney,

⁹⁰ See Ellis (1977: 32)

⁹¹ See Ellis (1977: 29-34)

⁹² See Lovell and Hillier (1972: 145-58); Armes (1978: 263-279); Higson (1986: 72-97); Hedling (1998: 41-49) and Tibbetts (1999: 49-80).

⁹³ See Tibbetts (1999: 49-80).

⁹⁴ Although Schlesinger's first two features, *A Kind of Loving* (1962) and *Billy Liar* (1963) can be categorised as part of the 'New Wave', he is something of an outsider within the movement. Despite a

Keith Waterhouse and Stan Barstow to the screen with the same realist style and aesthetic they had brought to their documentaries. Richardson was the first of the Free Cinema alumni to graduate into making features.⁹⁵ Spurred on by the success of his documentaries, his productions of Osborne's *Look Back in Anger* and *The Entertainer* at the Royal Court Theatre, and the rapturous reception of Jack Clayton's film adaptation of John Braine's *Room at the Top* (1958),⁹⁶ Richardson and Osborne formed Woodfall Films with the Hollywood impresario Harry Saltzman and produced film versions of both *Look Back in Anger* (1959) and *The Entertainer* (1960), with Richardson directing and Osborne adapting his plays for the screen.⁹⁷ Both films were a great success critically and commercially. With the feature debuts of both Reisz⁹⁸

background in documentaries - he, like Ken Russell, made films for the BBC's 'Monitor' and 'Omnibus' - and having won a prize at the Venice Film Festival for his documentary, *Terminus* (1961), which records a day in the life of Waterloo Station, was not part of the Free Cinema movement, and showed less commitment to documenting social problems and the plight of the working class than his contemporaries. Indeed, his third feature, *Darling* (1965), with its examination of the rise of the fashion conscious, materialistic middle-class in 'Swinging Sixties' London, could not have been further removed from the Northern industrial working class milieu favoured by his contemporaries. See Hacker and Price (1991: 382-409).

⁹⁵ Richardson was the most prolific filmmaker of the British New Wave, and went on to make six features between 1959 and 1963: *Look Back in Anger*, *The Entertainer*, *Sanctuary* (1961, made in Hollywood), *A Taste of Honey* (1961), *The Loneliness of the Long Distance Runner* (1962) and *Tom Jones* (1963), after which he returned to Hollywood. See Welsh and Tibbetts (1999).

⁹⁶ The film's favourable critical reception and the importance it had in launching the 'New Wave' is addressed in Durgnat (1970: 129); Hallam (2000: 46); and Aldgate and Richards (2002: 186).

⁹⁷ While, according to John Hill, it has become commonplace to view the British cinema of the 1950s and 1960s in terms of a breakthrough, surfacing first, as a series of documentaries screened at the national film theatre under the banner of 'Free Cinema' and bursting into full bloom with the appearance in commercial cinemas of *Room at the Top* and *Look Back in Anger* in 1959 (1986: 127), in *A Mirror for England* Raymond Durgnat argued that the connection between 'Free Cinema' and the 'New Wave' is not as strong as many have assumed and that:

[it] wasn't *Momma Don't Allow* that brought Tony Richardson into the directorial chair of *Look Back in Anger*; it was the fact that he had directed the play on the London stage. While the partisans of Free Cinema were directing stage plays and TV commercials, the new wave arose from response to the work of artists in other media. Far from originating in the new documentary approach, the impulse came from [...] plays [...] novels [...] and a new generation of actors [...] The films are based on proven successes in other media, their production stimulated by the influence of new talents on commercial producers (1970: 129).

This latter opinion, which views the 'New Wave' as overly dependent on established literary sources, will be examined more below, and has been supported by Wollen (1993: 35-51).

⁹⁸ Reisz made his feature debut with his film version of Alan Silitoe's *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* (1960), again adapted for the screen by the original author himself. The film was also a success, and Reisz's direction, which is more controlled and disciplined than that of Richardson, and

and Anderson - *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* (1960) and *This Sporting Life* (1963) - as well as Schlesinger's *A Kind of Loving* (1962), following soon after, the British 'New Wave' began to take form and suggested the possibility of fictional social realist cinema that could occupy the place of art cinema in Britain.

Many attributes of the British 'New Wave' however, like the British Documentary Movement before it, serve to highlight the problematic nature of discussing them in terms of art cinema. While it 'has often been noted how such British films [...] were indebted to the French *nouvelle vague*' (Hill, 1986: 134), on the most obvious level, the British 'New Wave' fails to qualify as art cinema in the European tradition due to its almost total disregard of modernist impulses. Despite the movement's title, it is problematic to compare the British 'New Wave' with its counterparts in 1960s' Europe,⁹⁹ such as the *Nouvelle Vague* and the modernist cinema of Fellini, Antonioni and Bertolucci that grew out of *neo-realism* in Italy. Rather, the directors that comprised the British 'New Wave' consciously rejected and criticised modernist experiment and viewed the works of filmmakers such as Antonioni, Resnais and Godard as elitist, socially unmotivated and concerned with art and experimentation for their own sakes. Indeed, few British films of this period 'used [the] jump cuts, irises, wide-screen framing or references to other movies'

the central performances of Albert Finney and Rachel Roberts ensured that the film has stood the test of time better than many of the other new wave films. Unlike the prolific Richardson, Reisz chose his film projects carefully, though not always wisely, and after electing to hand over directing duties on *This Sporting Life* (1963) to Anderson, opted instead to produce, his follow-up to *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* finally emerged as *Night Must Fall* (1964), a dour adaptation of Emlyn Williams's play about a quiet bellboy who is also a mass murderer, which had previously been filmed in Hollywood in 1937. The film demonstrates the gradual departure from social realism in both the style and content of British New Wave filmmakers, and their increasing move towards America for finance and an audience.

⁹⁹ The *nouvelle vague*, like the British 'New Wave' began in 1959 with the release of Chabrol's *Le Beau Serge*, Godard's *A Bout de Souffle* and Truffaut's *The 400 Blows*. The parallel Italian movement, although not officially called a 'New Wave' can be seen to begin in 1960 when both Fellini and Antonioni moved away from their *neo-realist* roots and made the decidedly more modernist *La Dolce Vita* and *L'avventura* respectively.

(Cousins, 2004: 299) that so instantly characterised their French counterparts. Rather, as Kingsley Amis argued, the 'New Wave' saw the adventurous path as being 'the one that leads away from experiment [and] Realism [...] for both stylistic and political reasons, [became] the ruling mode for the new British cinema and television as it developed in the sixties' (quoted in Caughie, 2000: 65).

Wollen has noted that the British 'New Wave's' preference of realism over modernism is one of several reasons why it is 'both inappropriate and misleading' (Wollen, 1993: 36) to view it as a true 'New Wave'. Modernism, according to Wollen, is one of the key aspects of a cinematic 'New Wave', along with 'directorial authorship [and] putting film first and not subordinating it to literature or theatre' (Wollen, 1993: 36-7). The British 'New Wave' conforms to none of these however, as 'nobody has made a serious claim for the auteurist credentials of Reisz, Richardson, Schlesinger, and others' (Wollen, 1993: 36-7),¹⁰⁰ partly because the 'Angry Young Men films plainly put film second' (Wollen, 1993: 36).

There were however, examples of films being made in Britain, outside of the collaborations with the 'Angry Young Men', that have the qualities Wollen argues are essential to a 'New Wave'. Ironically, these films were often made by foreign directors,¹⁰¹ including American ex-patriots such as Richard Lester and Joseph Losey, and a number of European filmmakers, such as Antonioni, Polanski and Truffaut who briefly came to England to make films at the height of the 'swinging sixties'.¹⁰² These international filmmakers brought to their work a greater modernist sensibility than

¹⁰⁰ Hedling has in fact argued that Reisz, like Anderson, should be viewed as an *auteur* (2003: 25).

¹⁰¹ See Street (1997: 165-7).

¹⁰² Cousins correctly notes that '[t]hings changed in Britain around 1963, however [as] London had become the music and fashion capital of the Europe' (2004: 299). This not only attracted European filmmakers to Britain, it also served to change the attitudes of domestic British filmmakers. Thus, the 'Northern sociological seriousness of Anderson, Richardson and Reisz and others gave way to movies that tried to capture some of the playfulness of the new "swinging" capital' (Cousins, 2004: 299), such

their native British contemporaries. Lester's work for example, is notable for its exuberant style, drawn equally on the *nouvelle vague* and the anarchic humour of the Goon Show and H.C. Potter's *Hellzapoppin'* (1941). His early work, *It's Trad Dad* (1962), *A Hard Day's Night* (1964), *Help* (1965) and *The Knack...and How to Get it* (1965), operated just outside of the British 'New Wave' and represented a clever combination of contemporary art house-style complete with hand-held cameras and fast-paced editing laden with jump-cuts, with popular entertainment often in the form of musical comedy.¹⁰³

Losey's work, on the other hand, represented the more controlled, intellectual modernism of filmmakers such as Antonioni and Resnais.¹⁰⁴ He relocated to Britain after his blacklisting by the House of Un-American Activities Committee in 1951 and 'brought to British cinema the eccentric sensibility of the exile, belonging neither to America, Britain or Europe [...] creating an art cinema of refined perspectives' (Caughie and Rockett, 1996: 105). His work ranged from *The Criminal*, (1960), arguably the finest prison drama made in Britain (Sinyard, 2003: 121), to more European style art films such as *The Servant* (1963), *Accident* (1967) and *The Go-Between* all made in collaboration with Harold Pinter.¹⁰⁵ According to David Caute, *Accident* is one of the key British art films of the 1960s (1994: 182). The film is so stylistically restrained and deceptively simple in its visual sense, that Pinter admitted to being 'surprised at the [...] simplicity with which Losey is directing the film: no elaborations, no odd angles, no darting about. Just a level, intense look at people'

as Schlesinger's *Darling*, Lester's *The Knack...and How to Get It* (1965) and Antonioni's *Blow-Up*.

¹⁰³ See Bayer (1973: 97); Andrew (1989: 167-8) and Lester and Soderbergh (1999: 23-9).

¹⁰⁴ See Sinyard (2003: 123).

¹⁰⁵ He also produced genuinely eccentric works like *Modesty Blaise* (1966), a pop-art parody of James Bond with Monica Vitti as the hero, and *Boom* and *Secret Ceremony* (both 1968) which both starred Elizabeth Taylor, alongside Richard Burton and Robert Mitchum respectively, and represent a fascinating, but ultimately unsuccessful attempt 'to bring the star system to art cinema' (Caughie and

(Caute, 1994: 190). Despite the film's straightforward style, it is unquestionably modernist in content. The plot centres on an Oxford philosophy don, Stephen (Dirk Bogarde), his lustful feelings for one of his students, an Austrian aristocrat named Anna, and his feelings of guilt and remorse over the death of her fiancé, another of his students, in a car crash outside his house. Unsurprisingly for a film whose main character is a philosophy don, *Accident* is a film concerned with moral and ethical questions rather than action. However, as the Bogarde character says, 'Philosophy is a process of inquiry only, it doesn't attempt to find specific answers to specific questions' and many of the questions raised by the film, such as who was driving the car, why Stephen does not tell the police that Anna was in the car, why Stephen lends his colleague the use of his house to have sex with Anna, or why Anna gives in to Stephen's violent sexual advances, remain unanswered. The film also features a complex time structure, which flashes back from the accident at the start of the film to the key events and circumstances in the month that lead up to it. These time distortions and ambiguities, coupled with the palate of the Eastman Colour cinematography recall another understated art film about time and guilt, Alan Resnais' *Muriel* (1963), an influence further augmented by the presence of Delphine Seyrig, the star of Resnais' film, in a cameo.

Although British filmmakers began to betray the influence of European art cinema more overtly during the 1960s, and demonstrated a more substantial engagement with modernism, particularly in work such as Jack Clayton's *The Pumpkin Eater*, which drew on Antonioni in both its structure and compositions,¹⁰⁶ the majority of British films by native directors seemed to lack the cutting-edge modernist

Rockett, 1996: 105). See also Caute (1994: 218-37).

¹⁰⁶ See Sinyard (2000: 109-129) and Thompson (2002 (a): 887).

inclinations of films like Antonioni's *Blow-Up*. There were some rare films by native British filmmakers, such as Anderson's *If...* (1968), that equalled the formal inventiveness and radicalism of these continental directors.¹⁰⁷

Anderson's work, of all the alumni of 'Free Cinema' and the 'New Wave', has been the most consistently interesting and worthy of more in-depth critical attention.¹⁰⁸ On one level, Anderson's career seems erratic, with large periods of time elapsing between individual films, and tones and styles ranging 'from the romantic and idealized, to social realism, and on to caustic and anarchic satire' (Hacker and Price, 1991: 27). Indeed, it is sometimes difficult to reconcile the social realism of his early 'Free Cinema' films and his feature debut, *This Sporting Life* - the hardest edged and the most physically and emotionally violent of British 'New Wave' films - with the modernist and Brechtian inclinations of *If...*¹⁰⁹ and *O Lucky Man*.¹¹⁰ However, throughout these shifts in style and tone, one could argue that he has remained a rare example of an 'authentic [British] *auteur*' (Wollen, 1993: 37).¹¹¹

The style of Anderson's early documentaries such as *O Dreamland* and *Every Day Except Christmas* was 'developed from the Humphrey Jennings poetic tradition rather than the sociological tradition of the John Grierson school' (Caughie and Rockett, 1996: 20) and marked a return in British documentary filmmaking to the qualities of bold imagery, imaginative use of music and sound and surreal wit that had been 'missing since Humphrey Jennings's wartime films' (Barsam, 1992: 252).¹¹² For

¹⁰⁷ See Hedling (1997: 178-86) and (1998: 80-112) and Sinker (2004).

¹⁰⁸ See Cook (2005: 487-8).

¹⁰⁹ Anderson himself called *If...* 'a realistic film - not completely naturalistic but trying to penetrate the reality of its particular world' (Aldgate and Richards, 2002: 208).

¹¹⁰ See Hacker and Price (1991: 27-43) and Hedling (1998: 1-4).

¹¹¹ Wollen's argument is echoed by John Russell Taylor, who noted that, 'among the directors at present working in British cinema [...] Anderson is the only one [...] who is [...] undoubtedly and unquestionably an *auteur*' (1975: 69).

¹¹² See also Hill (1986: 127-9) and Ellis and McLane (2005: 196-206).

example, in *O Dreamland*, a short documentary about Dreamland Amusement Park in Margate, was comparable to Jennings' *Spare Time* (1938) in its depiction of the leisure habits of the working class,¹¹³ Anderson includes a shot of several women breaking into an impromptu can-can for the benefit of the camera. The inclusion of this slightly surreal shot goes against the carefully scripted nature of the Grierson school of documentary filmmaking and the more distant, observational style of later documentary schools.

Anderson's early documentaries revealed him to be the true successor to Jennings. His feature films of the mid-1960s and early 1970s however, approached realism in a complex way similar to the work of Powell and Pressburger.¹¹⁴ For example, *The White Bus* (1966), an overlooked short feature, 'looks forward to Anderson's blurring of the fantastic and the naturalistic in *If...*' (Thompson, 2002 (b): 1285). Telling the story of a violent armed rebellion by a small band of students at an oppressive boys' boarding school, *If...* was a 'romantic and "deeply anarchistic" reaction against the destructive aspects of the class hierarchy, traditions, and hollowed institutions' (Hacker and Price, 1991: 35). Anderson kept the viewer constantly off-balance by deftly alternating the tone of the film between conventional realism and surreal flights of fancy. Anderson and his cinematographer, Miroslav Ondricek,¹¹⁵ made the decision to shoot the film predominantly in Eastman Colour, but to shoot certain scenes in black and white (a technique employed to a lesser extent in *The White Bus*). However, Anderson and Ondricek did not switch between the two modes of photography systematically to distinguish between fantasy and reality in the way Powell and Pressburger alternated between them to differentiate heaven and earth in *A*

¹¹³ Hedling (1997: 179-80).

¹¹⁴ See Humm (1997: 172) and Street (1997: 164).

Matter of Life and Death. Rather, they switched between them seemingly randomly.¹¹⁶ Yet, like Powell and Pressburger's film, Anderson and Ondricek seemed keen to subvert the traditional view that black and white is a more 'realistic' mode of photography than colour. This is particularly evident in the love-hate scene between Mick and 'the girl' in the Packhorse Café, which culminates in a violent sex scene shot in black and white. While it is possible that this scene realistically depicts the course of events, it is far more probable that it is a subjective depiction of Mick's fantasy, ironically and subversively presented in 'realistic' black and white, and demonstrating the manner in which Anderson was moving away from the realist dogma of Free Cinema and the 'New Wave', towards a more personal and idiosyncratic style that, at its best, combined documentary-like observations worthy of Jennings with elements of the Romanticism of Powell and Pressburger and the surrealism of continental filmmakers like Buñuel, Cocteau and Vigo.

The influence of Vigo can be felt especially strongly in the film. While few reviewers have called *If...* an outright remake of Vigo's seminal *Zéro de Conduite* (1933), key similarities between the two films are evident.¹¹⁷ Both are set in oppressive boarding-schools, open with the arrival of the children after the summer holiday, and end with a band of students rebelling against the establishment on speech day. However, Anderson's film makes a number of changes to Vigo's film, that are in keeping with the social and political climate in which the film was made. For example, the character of the headmaster (Philip Jeffrey), especially in his espousing of liberal ideas, bears comparison to the young, Chaplinesque teacher played by Jean

¹¹⁵ Ondricek had previously shot Milos Forman's Czech 'New Wave' films *The Loves of a Blonde* (1965) and *The Fireman's Ball* (1967), as well as Anderson's earlier *The White Bus*.

¹¹⁶ See Hedling (1998: 66-9).

¹¹⁷ Sinker argues that 'there are several layers of reversionary rewrite, in several media, deftly packed [into *if...*] (2004: 18), including *Zero de Conduite*, Thomas Hughes' *Tom Brown's School Days* and

Daste in Vigo's film, who is the only teacher to support the boys and their rebellion. Daste's character literally applauds the speech day uprising at the close of *Zéro de Conduite* but when Jeffery's headmaster steps forward and urges the boys to trust him, claiming that he understands their action, he is shot in the head by 'the girl'.¹¹⁸ Vigo's idealistic inter-war left-wing anarchism conceded the possibility of a few enlightened adults truly understanding the actions of the children. Anderson's film, made in the midst of the revolutionary fervour of 1968 cannot put its trust in any authority figures, and the headmaster's declarations of trust and understanding ring entirely hollow. Anderson's changes to Vigo's film are appropriate. While the rebellion of the (far younger) students in *Zéro de Conduite* is violent, it is also playful and does not seek to harm anyone in any real way, whereas the one at the end of *If...* is a fully escalated armed revolt, made with the precise intention of killing the adults present at the speech day celebrations. This is in keeping with the time in which the film was made and the increasingly dark and desperate tone of Anderson's film. Indeed the final image of Mick firing his Bren gun directly at the camera, and literally 'turning [it] on the audience' (Aldgate and Richards, 2002: 208) not only echoes the infamous final shot of Edwin S. Porter's *The Great Train Robbery* (1903), it also projects a direct and violent challenge to the complacent cinema viewer.¹¹⁹

However, if Anderson's film seemed to have sympathy with the causes of the students and the left in general in 1968, the two subsequent films he made starring Malcolm McDowell as a character named Mick Travis, the sprawling and anarchic *O Lucky Man!* (1973), and the satirical farce of the National Health Service and Thatcher's Britain, *Britannia Hospital* (1982), would become increasingly desperate

Rudyard Kipling's *Stalky and Co.*. See also Kael (1994: 279-86).
¹¹⁸ See Aldgate and Richards (2002: 207-8) and Sinker (2004: 78-80).

and cynical in their outlook. *O Lucky Man!* reinvents the rebellious Mick Travis as a modern-day Candide who journeys through a nightmarish vision of modern Britain.¹²⁰ The film builds on the modernist experiments of *If...* and is full of Brechtian devices from the knowing, theatrical performances, the blackouts and inter-titles that divide the separate sequences and a number of musical interludes, written by Alan Price, that provide an ironic commentary on the action.¹²¹ However, while the boarding school in *If...* functioned superbly as a metaphor for Britain and the use of *Zéro de Conduite* gave the film a sense of structural discipline, *O Lucky Man!* takes the already episodic structure of the road movie as its form,¹²² and therefore lacks the discipline of the earlier film. At over three hours, it comes dangerously close to self-indulgence. The film shows a palpable sense of disillusionment, which shows a strong distrust not just of capitalism, governments, science and technology, but also of the common man, as personified by Mick himself.

By the time of *Britannia Hospital* this distrust had developed into full-blown misanthropy. Like *If...* the film uses a single institution, here a London hospital, as a metaphor for the nation. *Britannia Hospital* may seem far tighter in structure than *O Lucky Man!*, and it is hard not to feel sympathy for the film's righteous anger. This soon turns to bitterness, as even the left-wing protestors who riot at the film's end, who would have been the natural heroes of *If...*, are here depicted with the same loathsome indignation as the bureaucrats, corrupt union officials, despots, royals.

¹¹⁹ See also Sinker (2004: 79-80).

¹²⁰ The vast plot is difficult to summarize, but briefly, Mick begins the film as a coffee salesman with grand ambitions to wealth and corporate success. He goes on the road and undergoes a surreal series of adventures: he visits a brothel for businessmen, is arrested and tortured at a fascist military camp, witnesses Frankenstein-like experiments with doctors grafting a man's head onto a pig's body, has an affair with the daughter of a powerful industrialist and finally becomes involved in a plot to sell Napalm to an invented African nation, for which he is duly arrested. Finally, Mick stumbles onto a film set and is chosen, by Anderson, to play the lead in the film we have just seen.

¹²¹ See MacCabe (1974: 234-5) and Hedling (1998: 126-148).

¹²² See Hedling (1997: 182).

journalists and evil scientists the film also targets. *Britannia Hospital* is a flawed film, which perhaps fails to live up to its ambitions of neo-Swiftian satire and rather comes across as a politicised *Carry On* film with artistic pretensions.¹²³ However, with *If...* and *O Lucky Man!*, it forms a fascinating and fantastical trilogy of films that chart both the decline of the nation and the death of a romantic and rebellious ideology over thirty years of British history.

Ken Russell and Nicolas Roeg.

Running alongside Anderson's modernist experiments of the late 1960s and early 1970s was the work of several other British filmmakers who can be characterised, in varying ways, as art film directors. Ken Loach's television films such as *Up the Junction* (1965) and *Cathy Come Home* (1966), and early feature films, such as *Kes* (1968) and *Family Life* (1971), Mike Leigh's debut feature *Bleak Moments* (1971) and Bill Douglas' autobiographical films *My Childhood* (1972) and *My Ain Folk* (1973), represented a British art cinema more in the realist traditions of the British 'New Wave' and Italian *neo-realism*. Running counter to these films was the work of Ken Russell and Nicolas Roeg, 'who both possessed visual qualities rarely found in directors of any nationality' (Walker, 1985 (b): 95). Their work also displayed the elements of 'bad taste', and suspicions towards realism that had previously characterised the films of Powell and Pressburger.

This co-existence of the opposing realist and anti-realist traditions of British art cinema in the late 1960s and early 1970s, marked a departure from British cinema's previous tendency to favour one mode of art cinema over the other, and

¹²³ See Andrew (2002 (b): 142). Jarman frequently defended the film however, and considered it one

paved the way for the emergence of a varied and eclectic British art cinema in the late 1970s and 1980s. The filmmakers in question not only influenced many of the filmmakers of contemporary British art cinema, they also participated in it to varying degrees. Douglas was a marginal, though respected figure, making only two more films before his early death in 1991, *My Way Home* (1978), the conclusion to his autobiographical trilogy, and *Comrades* (1986), an epic British film based around the story of the Tolpuddle Martyrs.¹²⁴ Loach and Leigh however, despite spending most of the 1970s and early 1980s working in television and documentaries, went on to become two of the leading international figures of British art cinema in the 1990s. Roeg and Russell rather worked on its peripheries, often making 'British' films in America or with American backing.¹²⁵ Despite the trans-Atlantic nature of their films and their somewhat marginalized place in contemporary British art cinema, Russell's and Roeg's work has consistently engaged with the dominant trends of European modernist cinema and has exerted a strong influence on contemporary British art filmmakers such as Jarman, Greenaway and Potter. Therefore, this section will briefly assess their contribution to British cinema from the 1960s until the 1980s, beginning with Russell's television films of the 1960s.

After a number of amateur films, including the acclaimed *Amelia and the Angel* (1958),¹²⁶ which brought him to the attention of Huw Wheldon, Russell began his professional filmmaking career at the BBC where, between 1959 and 1970, under Wheldon's guidance he made a series of short, and later feature-length, documentaries about renowned artists and composers.¹²⁷ These subjects, and Russell's treatment of

of the masterpieces of British cinema. See Hacker and Price (1991: 259).

¹²⁴ See Dick, Noble and Petrie (1993: 173-196).

¹²⁵ Walker (1985 (a): 98).

¹²⁶ See Ellis (1977: 27) and Russell (1993: 82)

¹²⁷ These included *Prokofiev* (1961), *Elgar* (1962), Debussy (*The Debussy Film*, 1965), Dante Gabriel

them, could not have differed more from Free Cinema's concern with portraying social issues about contemporary youth culture and the working class. Russell's films rather interested in greatness and artistic creation and demonstrated a 'personal identification with the lives of the Romantic artists' (Armes, 1978: 303).

Similarly, the aesthetics of Russell's documentaries were also far removed from those of his Free Cinema contemporaries, whom Russell saw as 'rooted in the wartime documentaries of Humphrey Jennings, [whereas he] was inspired by the bold imagery of Fritz Lang and the surreal world of Jean Cocteau' (Russell, 1993: 81). This may be something of an over-simplification and a provocation typical of Russell, but there is no denying that his television documentaries did indeed feature bold imagery and had an unique cinematic style - part continental experiment, part Hollywood spectacle - that was lacking even in British feature films of the time. As Russell himself wrote, '[all] the biopix [*sic*] [I made] were really feature films masquerading under the banner of TV documentaries' (Russell, 1993: 100). Take for example the opening of Russell's *Elgar* (1962), in which a young Edward Elgar is pictured riding his white pony across the Malvern Hills. The fast tracking shots and pans seem to share the boy's boundless energy and stand as a memorable cinematic opening to a British film equal to the fast and energetic motorcycle chase in *The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp*. Furthermore, as it is highly unlikely that Elgar rode across the Malvern Hills as a boy, the scene becomes less a documentary recreation of fact than a pure Romantic fantasy on the part of Russell. Russell's frequent liberties with the truth have been a source of widespread criticism of his numerous films about the lives of artists, and his stylistic flourishes have led to charges of excess. However, this energy and Romanticism are the dominant forces in Russell's work, and scenes

Rossetti (*Dante's Inferno*, 1967) and Frederick Delius (*Delius: Song of Summer*, 1968).

like the opening of *Elgar*, are finally less concerned with biographical accuracy than they are with capturing the spirit of the artist's work and the energies of the creative process.

Elgar, along with his feature adaptation of D.H. Lawrence's *Women in Love* (1968), has in many ways become Russell's most lasting and popular work. Broadcast three more times over the 1960s after its first telecast in November 1962, 'polls indicate it to be the second favourite TV program of the decade in Britain' (Gomez, 1976: 32). Gomez accounts for this popularity partly because *Elgar*, by Russell's standards, is a 'safe film' (Gomez, 1976: 32), with a greater emphasis on historical accuracy and authenticity than usual, and less recourse to visual excess. Perhaps most importantly, Russell's *Elgar* was no impenetrable aesthete and 'people could respond or perhaps even identify with this romantic hero' (Gomez, 1976: 32). One reason why *Elgar* remains one of Russell's more successful works is precisely that he manages to reign in the more excessive tendencies of his visual style without sacrificing it completely. Indeed, while the film is otherwise sober, the 'characteristic Russell love of extremes is already apparent' (Armes, 1978: 303) in the sequence that juxtaposes 'Pomp and Circumstance March No. 1' with graphic, found footage from the First World War 'for ironic effect' (Gomez, 1976: 32). If the validity of Russell's assertion in the film that Elgar came to despise the jingoistic connotations of his most famous piece may be questionable, it 'clearly showed [Russell's] growing interest in presenting his own views and/or interpretations of events and attitudes' (Gomez, 1976: 32-3).

Russell's films at the BBC increasingly began to defy documentary convention as he fought Wheldon and others for the right to use actors to play the protagonists in his documentaries. In *Elgar* he was finally allowed to use actors to portray the

composer and his wife. However, they could only be framed in medium and long shots and 'it was understood that they would not speak' (Gomez, 1976: 32). With each successive film however, producers began to give in to Russell, and in *Bartok* (1964), the follow-up to *Elgar*, he was allowed to use an actor for the title role and to shoot him in close-up. In *The Debussy Film* (1965), Russell and his frequent co-writer Melvyn Bragg, 'found an ingenious way of circumventing the limitations of the established BBC format' (Gomez, 1976: 33) by making the film about a film crew working on the eponymous 'Debussy film'. This for the first time allowed the actors to talk on screen, both as the members of the film crew and as the real-life 'characters' they portray in the fictional 'Debussy film'.

In the three major works that would follow *The Debussy Film* for the BBC, *Isadora Duncan, The Biggest Dancer in the World* (1966); *Dante's Inferno* (1967) and *Delius: Song of Summer* (1968), the role of actors was gradually expanded. *Delius: Song of Summer*, made in collaboration with Delius' one-time assistant, the composer Eric Fenby, certainly owes more to the conventions of drama than documentary and features memorable performances from Max Adrian as the tyrannical Delius and Christopher Gable as Fenby. Gomez argues that these late television films represent the maturation of Russell's visual style as he 'creates flowing, intricate patterns to accompany visual action and aural imagery' (Gomez, 1976: 39) and strives, like the work of his cinematic hero, Sergei Eisenstein, to fuse the art of cinema with the older art forms, music and dance in particular.¹²⁸ Equally Russell's approach to his material in these films sets the tone for his subsequent

¹²⁸ In this way, Russell's work is comparable to that of Powell and Pressburger. As Street notes, the work of Powell and Pressburger relates with 'the composed film (a film shot to a previously composed score, most evidently in *Black Narcissus*, *The Red Shoes* and [*The*] *Tales of Hoffman*) back to debates about the affinities between film and music: early attempts to align film with film with music rather than literature' (Street, 1997: 161).

feature biopics - *The Music Lovers* (1970), *Savage Messiah* (1972), *Mahler* (1974), *Lisztomania* (1979), *Valentino* (1977) and his final television film, *The Dance of the Seven Veils* (1970) - especially in what Gomez sees as a 'tripartite perspective' in each of the films, 'which incorporates the protagonist's own romantic self-image, a more objective view revealed by the perspective of time, and finally Russell's personal vision of his subject' (Gomez, 1976: 35).

Russell had been hired to direct his first feature, *French Dressing*, in 1963 after the success of *Elgar*, and his second, an adaptation of Len Deighton's Harry Palmer novel *The Billion Dollar Brain* in 1967. Neither were suitable projects for a director of Russell's style and sensibilities. It was not until he was hired by Larry Kramer at United Artists to direct an adaptation of D.H. Lawrence's *Women in Love* that Russell made a feature with the same signature style he had developed at the BBC.¹²⁹ It maintains the tripartite perspective Gomez sees as emerging in Russell's late television work, and for the most part manages the difficult task of balancing Lawrence's attitudes to characters and period with his own. While *Women in Love* was a popular and commercial success, and won an American Academy Award for Glenda Jackson,¹³⁰ 'its importance as a motion picture is not as great as is casually supposed' (Gomez, 1976: 93). This is perhaps because the film, like *Elgar*, is relatively safe by Russell's standards. It certainly shows the same restraint, punctuated with moments of bravura filmmaking - such as the intercutting of the drowned lovers with Rupert Birkin and Ursula making love in the grass, the film's best examination of the interrelation of sex and death - as the earlier film. However, *Women in Love* is central to the development of Russell's career, as it not only

¹²⁹ See Armes (1978: 303) and Walker (1985 (b): 98).

¹³⁰ The film received three further nominations, including for Russell himself as director. Larry Kramer

established him as an international talent, its popular success also afforded him, at least temporarily, the power and means to make ambitious yet personal films for big studios without sacrificing creative control, and to develop into a unique and distinctive *auteur*.

Perhaps more than any other British filmmaker before Jarman or Greenaway, the concept of the director as *auteur* is essential to understanding Russell and his work. The sheer force of personality which Russell exerts over his films makes him one of the quintessential *auteurs* in world cinema.¹³¹ Even if the film of *Women in Love* finally owes more to Lawrence's text than to Russell's personal concerns, and often entire scenes are depicted and scripted exactly as Lawrence had written them - including the infamous and some would even say risible nude wrestling scene between Gerald Critch (Oliver Reed) and Rupert Birkin (Alan Bates) - it has come under criticism for its typically Russellian qualities of provocation, excess and vulgarity. Russell would demonstrate this definitively *auteurist* ability to project his personal vision onto another's writing on many future occasions, as all of his films were based on a written source of one kind or another, whether it be a novel, biography or libretto.¹³²

The relative restraint both in terms of technique and personal expression noticeable in *Women in Love*, cannot however, be detected in his two subsequent features,¹³³ *The Music Lovers*, and *The Devils* (both 1971). The former, a film about

as screenwriter and Billy Williams as Cinematographer.

¹³¹ Both *The Music Lovers* and *The Devils* have the prefix 'Ken Russell's...' in their opening credits, making Russell a rare example of a British filmmaker receiving this kind of *auteurist* accreditation usually reserved for European filmmakers such as Fellini.

¹³² This is particularly the case with *Altered States* (1980), his first film made in Hollywood, where the film's screenwriter, Paddy Chayevsky, who was adapting his own novel, insisted on having his name removed from the credits as he felt that Russell had irrevocably changed the essence of his script even after Russell had followed his contractual obligation not to alter a word of it. See Walker (1985 (b): 101-3).

¹³³ Between *Women in Love* and *The Music Lovers* Russell would also make *The Dance of the Seven*

Tchaikovsky, is typically remembered for its lurid depiction of the repressed homosexual composer's marriage to an unstable nymphomaniac and its highly personal visual interpretation of Tchaikovsky's work, in particular the infamous '1812 Overture' sequence, which visualises the composer riding a cannon and firing it at his critics, audience and finally his wife. This scene has been dismissed as 'pure Monty Python' (Taylor, 2002: 786), implying that it is mere burlesque, a crass joke that says little constructive about the composer's work or personal psychology. More successful perhaps is the opening sequence of *Mahler*, which depicts the composer 'dreaming' his 'Third Symphony', 'in which the figure of a struggling woman, after failing to break through the confines of a chrysalis, crawls slowly across a barren landscape to caress a rock shaped much like the composer's face' (Gomez, 1976: 185). On one level this offers an allegory of the music itself, and an in-joke typical of Russell, as the original title of the symphony's first movement was 'What the Rocks Tell Me',¹³⁴ but on a deeper level the sequence provides a metaphorical summary of the film itself. This is in many ways equally about the creativity of Mahler's wife being stifled by the pressures of marriage, motherhood and caring for a temperamental genius. Although still prone to many of the stylistic excesses of films such as (the suppressed) *The Dance of the Seven Veils* and *The Music Lovers*, the underlying seriousness of *Mahler*, which examines the way in which the genius has the potential

Veils, his last film for the BBC. Subtitled *A Comic Strip in Seven Episodes on the Life of Richard Strauss*, the film, according to Russell, was 'the grand exception to the rule' (Russell, 1993: 100) of his BBC films. Russell describes it as a 'Kodacolor extravaganza [which] portrayed the composer as an amalgam of the characters portrayed in his music, including Don Juan and Zarathustra the superman, then stripped them away to reveal the Nazi underneath' (Russell, 1993: 100). Strauss's son decried the film as slanderous and threatened legal action against both Russell and the BBC, and as a result the film was never publicly shown again after its original broadcast in February 1970. Russell would not work for the BBC again for another twenty-one years. Russell has argued that part of the problem 'arose from the fact that I had treated a serious subject in a style that was out-and-out kitsch' (Russell, 1993: 101) but defends the film by saying he 'was only reflecting in film the elements I found in the music' (Russell, 1993: 101).

¹³⁴ For more information on Mahler's *Third Symphony* and its evolution, see Franklin (1991). See also

to destroy not only himself, but those around him, is closer in tone and spirit to his best work for Monitor, *Delius: Song of Summer*.

The Devils, Russell's most notorious work, would remain a notable film in the development of British art cinema not least because the anachronistic, art-deco sets were designed by a young Derek Jarman.¹³⁵ It was during his time working on the film that Jarman got his first taste of industrial filmmaking, and began to move away from painting and develop ambitions of his own as a director. However, while Jarman's sets remain one of the film's finer points, it has many other virtues which are entirely due to Russell's unique vision as an artist. An adaptation of Aldous Huxley's book *The Devils of Loudon* and John Whiting's play based on the same. Much has been written about the film's excesses, such as masturbating nuns, sexually degrading interrogations, buckets of blood and vomit, torture scenes and the graphically detailed final execution by burning at the stake.¹³⁶ However, less attention has been paid to the film's qualities.

While the film has often been decried as blasphemous, one must remember that Russell had converted to Catholicism some ten years before he made the film, and in many ways *The Devils* is a declaration of faith.¹³⁷ Although the Catholicism practised by Grandier is neither orthodox nor dogmatic - it is revealed that he has had a string of lovers before Philippe, with whom he has a bastard son, and he later marries the innocent Madeleine (to whom he is resolutely faithful) - his faith is still genuine. Russell illustrates this in one of the film's sequences which brings 'the various threads of political, religious and sexual corruption together in a scene of

Walker (1985 (a): 82).

¹³⁵ Jarman also designed the sets for Russell's subsequent *Savage Messiah*. See Jarman (1984: 96-112).

¹³⁶ For all these criticisms, Russell 'is quick to remind people that he toned down much of the torments described in Huxley's book' (Gomez. 1976: 137).

spectacular perversion' (Kermode, 2002: 29). This sequence, which was to have climaxed with the infamous 'rape of Christ', which was cut from all existing prints of the film,¹³⁸ features images that show Russell at his most excessive and his most lyrical as he inter-cuts scenes in which the allegedly possessed nuns, spurred on by the exorcist, Father Barré, work themselves into an orgiastic frenzy, with shots which depict Grandier and Madeleine taking communion together at the roadside on his return journey from Paris to petition the king. The former scenes show Russell at his most controversial and excessive, choreographing the orgy of naked, bare-headed nuns with energetic editing and sweeping camera movements. In the latter however, Russell hardly moves his camera, as if he almost does not want to intrude on such a private and tender moment. The full force of Russell's meaning however, comes with the arrival of the king, incognito, at Loudon to see for himself the 'miracle' of the possessed nuns. Offering Father Barré an holy relic he claims is a phial of Christ's blood, it seems to instantly drive the demons from the nuns. Upon revealing that the relic was not more than an empty box, the nuns become more hysterical than before. Their possession, and the ravings of Father Barré are shown to all as fraudulent, but their blasphemies are genuine. In contrast, the juxtaposing scenes of Grandier and Madeleine reveal both true love and genuine faith.

The central tragedy of the film then is that Grandier, who is deeply flawed as a man, but true to his image of God, is still tortured, tried and executed even after the king, who does nothing to help him, has revealed the conspiracy. For Russell Grandier is a martyr, but the reasons for his death are political rather than religious, as he alone seems to stand in the way of Cardinal Richelieu's plans to destroy the city

¹³⁷ See Walker (1985 (b): 104).

¹³⁸ See Kermode (2002: 29-35).

wall of Loudun, and with them all sense of the town's autonomy. Russell emphasises Grandier's status as a martyr in a series of bold images and allusions to art and the Bible. The most obvious comes at the end of the nuns' orgy, when Grandier returns from Paris and storms into the church, announcing:

You have turned the house of the Lord into a circus, and its servants into clowns. You have seduced the people in order to destroy them. You have perverted the innocent.

Grandier's words and actions of righteous indignation immediately recall Christ's driving out of the money lenders from the temple. However, Russell is not making claims for Grandier as a Christ figure. Rather he implies that Grandier, like Christ, is a man whose faith and loyalties lie with God, not with any earthly power or dogma, and like Christ, Grandier will die at the hands of his enemies.

After Grandier's arrest, Russell also makes powerful allusions to two classic works by the Danish filmmaker Carl Theodore Dreyer, *Day of Wrath* (1943) in the gruesome torture scenes and *The Passion of Joan of Arc* (1929) during the trial, in which his head and beard are shaved and Russell films both his face and that of his accusers in close-up reminiscent of Dreyer's film. The burning at the stake, as in Dreyer's film, leads to a riot and an attack on the townspeople by government troops, at the end of which the walls of Loudun are destroyed. For once Russell's excesses seem entirely appropriate for the material. As Gomez notes, 'Grandier's sufferings were not a de Sadian fantasy re-filtered through the imagination of the director. They were real' (Gomez, 1976: 138). Russell, for all the considerable humour in the film, wants us to take *The Devils* seriously, both as a work of art and social and spiritual

statement.

By the mid-1970s however, after *Mahler*, Russell's work began to show signs of decline - despite having his greatest commercial success with *Tommy* (1975), a film of The Who's rock opera.¹³⁹ His artistic biopics *Lisztomania*¹⁴⁰ and *Valentino*, and his subsequent adaptations of Lawrence's *The Rainbow* (1989) and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1993, for television), lacked the control and quality of *Delius*, *Mahler* and *Women in Love*. Regardless of any decline in his gifts, Russell remains a luminary in British art cinema and one of its most authentic *auteurs*. As Geoff Andrew has noted, 'people tend to forget that he was virtually the first filmmaker to escape the structures of realism and telestyle that have dogged British cinema since the heyday of Powell and Pressburger' (Andrew, 2002 (k): 1190) and 'his importance lies in the way his example encouraged other British directors to abandon notions of realism and attempt more personal forms of filmmaking (Andrew, 1989: 253).¹⁴¹

Much the same can be said of Nicolas Roeg, who equally thrived in the 1970s (and in his case the early 1980s), but subsequently showed signs of decline. Roeg began his filmmaking career as one of Britain's most respected cinematographers.¹⁴² True to his training, Roeg is primarily noted as a visual filmmaker, a reputation he shares with both Powell and Russell, but which was otherwise rare in British cinema of the time. While it would be difficult to dispute Roeg's status as an *auteur*, he, like Powell, is a director who brings his own distinctive visual style to other people's

¹³⁹ See Armes (1978: 307); Walker (1985 (a): 83-4); Walker (1985 (b): 100-1).

¹⁴⁰ See Walker (1985 (a): 82-4); Walker (1985 (b): 101).

¹⁴¹ Russell has commented that he may have been better accepted in Britain if his name was 'Russellini' (Russell, 1993: 81).

¹⁴² Roeg's credits as a Cinematographer include Roger Corman's *The Masque of the Red Death* (1964), Richard Lester's *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum* (1966) and *Petulia* (1968), John Schlesinger's *Far from the Madding Crowd* (1967) and Francois Truffaut's *Fahrenheit 451* (1966). See Walker (1985 (b): 95-6) and Lanza (1989: 25-31).

scripts. To date Roeg has not written any of his film's screenplays¹⁴³, but he has worked with noted screenwriters including Paul Mayersberg on *The Man Who Fell to Earth* (1976) and *Eureka* (1982), Dennis Potter on *Track 29* (1987) and Alan Scott on *Don't Look Now* (1973),¹⁴⁴ *Castaway* (1986), *The Witches* (1989) and *Cold Heaven* (1990).

Apart from his distinctive visual sense, Roeg's films are easily identifiable due to their unique editing style, which not only shares Russell's affinity for shock cuts but also typically 'intercut[s] past, present and future in a disturbing surrealist montage' (Walker (b), 1985: 96) in a manner more reminiscent of Alan Resnais than any other British filmmaker.¹⁴⁵ A notable combination of these two elements can be seen early in *Don't Look Now*, when Roeg cuts from the sound of Laura Baxter screaming, having just seen her husband holding the drowned body of their daughter, to the sound and close-up image of a jackhammer drilling into a stone outside a Cathedral in Venice, where the Baxters are living, some months on. With this single cut Roeg moves the setting of his film, both in terms of time and location. This is bravura editing, comparable to the celebrated sequences in Powell and Pressburger's *A Canterbury Tale* in which a falcon flies into a cloud and (after an almost subliminal cut) emerges as a Spitfire, thus instantly moving the action of the film from the time of Chaucer to that of the Second World War. Roeg however, ups the ante somewhat by having the cut merge the sound of the scream with that of the jackhammer. This has the effect of both shocking and disorientating the viewer, with both the death of the girl and the momentary uncertainty as to where and when the film is now situated.

Much of Roeg's filmmaking style and his relationship with art cinema is

¹⁴³ An exception is the scenario for his extract in Don Boyd's portmanteau opera film *Aria* (1987). However, there is no dialogue.

evident in his first film, *Performance* (1970), which he shot and co-directed with the film's associate producer and writer Donald Cammell.¹⁴⁶ As O'Pray notes, *Performance* is something of a

commercial and mainstream product which could, however, lay some claim to the tradition of art cinema; it was funded, distributed and exhibited through the Hollywood based film industry with a budget of hundreds of thousands and used rock stars as major actors, but formally it shared many of the concerns of the European art film (1996 (c): 179).

Although filming was completed in 1968, *Performance* was not released until 1970, as the American financiers and distributors, Warner Brothers, who had been expecting a conventional gangster film or a marketable vehicle for the film's co-star, Mick Jagger, did not know what to make of the film and so spent two years trying to re-edit it into a version they deemed releasable.¹⁴⁷ The first thirty minutes, in which Jagger only appears almost subliminally,¹⁴⁸ is an almost conventional gangland movie, as it follows Chas (Edward Fox), a violent East-end enforcer through his daily routine of threats, beatings, extortion and sex. However, when Chas kills a rival, he is forced to go into hiding, and rents the basement bed-sit room of Turner (Jagger), a reclusive rock star who has lost his powers of incantation and lives in a decadent, drug fuelled haze with his two girlfriends. Once the film relocates to Turner's Notting Hill house, where it then almost never leaves, the film turns into a psychosexual nightmare that

¹⁴⁴ Co-written with Chris Bryant.

¹⁴⁵ See Andrew (1989: 242); Lanza (1989: 35) and Hacker and Price (1991: 367).

¹⁴⁶ For more about Cammell's life and work see MacCabe (1998) and Umland and Umland (2006).

¹⁴⁷ See Lazar (1989: 40-1) and MacCabe (1998: 57-60).

¹⁴⁸ See Lazar (1989: 41).

little of the film's first part prepared you for.

Turner, fascinated by his new lodger, and finding Chas's claims to be a performer laughable, starts to mentally torture him and tricks him into eating magic mushrooms and other hallucinogens. Essentially, as the film progresses and Chas begins to reveal his secrets and identity, he and Turner begin to swap places and personas, with Turner regaining his lost muse and the homophobic Chas admitting his sexual attraction to Turner. The film ends with Chas' pursuers tracking him down and Chas killing the complacent Turner. However, when he is led out to the car to be driven to his death, Chas has transformed into Turner. While it is perhaps the key British art film of the late 1960s and early 1970,¹⁴⁹ the film remains controversial for many reasons, including its treatment of 1960s drug culture, which was far more detailed and explicit than previous films that were regarded as 'frank', such as *Blow-Up*. However, by concentrating on the drugs, critics largely ignored what the film has to say about issues ranging from identity, sexuality, gender, mysticism, violence, power, drugs, art, music, filmmaking, underground culture, and the death of the 'swinging sixties'.¹⁵⁰ As John Walker notes, the film 'now seems a goodbye, a last wave for a bad trip, to a swinging, hippy, drug-happy era that had promised freedom and delivered soft slavery' (1985: 95).

The film also caused disputes amongst supporters of Roeg and Cammell who have argued over the film's authorship.¹⁵¹ More often than not however, the film is seen as Roeg's, as he has the more substantial body of work through which one can trace the familiar themes and filmmaking practices back to *Performance*. This may be

¹⁴⁹ See Wollen (1995: 20-3) and Sinyard (2003: 112).

¹⁵⁰ See Lanza (1989: 37-41) and MacCabe (1998).

¹⁵¹ However, neither Cammell or Roeg 'admit to *Performance* being anything other than a fifty-fifty collaboration' (Lanza, 1989: 38). See also Hacker and Price (1991: 356).

in many ways unjust¹⁵², and the tendency to leave Cammell's name off publicity for the film sometimes is inappropriate, *Performance* is best viewed as a collaboration, not a competition, and the film would certainly not have been as rich or complex had it been made by only one of the two filmmakers. As always Roeg visualised the writing of another, and the film's visual textures and qualities are unmistakably Roeg's. However, this time the writer had an equal say in the final film, and the blurring of sexual and gender boundaries, as well as the view of the underground subculture of which he was a leading exponent,¹⁵³ are more likely the concerns of Cammell.

However, the clash of two alien cultures and the theme of 'the reinvention of personality' (Lanza, 1989: 38) that emerge in *Performance*, are perhaps the central themes of Roeg's work. Roeg's follow-up to *Performance*, *Walkabout* (1971), was his first solo directorial effort.¹⁵⁴ The film was set in the Australian outback and centred on a young boy and girl lost in the desert after their father's suicide. They meet a young aborigine on his walkabout, a rite of passage where he must spend some weeks alone, living off the land, to become a man. He guides them back to civilization. With a straightforward story, little dialogue, desert setting, young characters, and relative innocence, the film could not, at first, have seemed more different from its predecessor. Yet, the aborigine and the girl, played by Jenny Agutter, whose relationship provides the core of the film, are as alien, but ultimately

¹⁵² As Cammell produced and wrote the film and oversaw its editing in Hollywood while Roeg was in Australia making *Walkabout*, Cammell's claim to authorship may be even stronger. However, his meagre output - only three more features, *Demonseed* (1976), *The White of the Eye* (1985) and *Wild Side* (1995-9), of which two were butchered by the studio, and a handful of shorts - and his suicide in 1995 meant that he has often come to be viewed as something of a footnote or cult curiosity rather than an *auteur* worthy of serious consideration.

¹⁵³ Cammell was at the time part of pop-art scene of the late 1960s and often seen with figures like Jagger or David Hockney. In America he would collaborate frequently with Kenneth Anger, even playing Osiris, in Anger's *Lucifer Rising*. See Landis (1995: 181).

¹⁵⁴ See Lanza (1989: 41-44).

attracted to one another as Chas and Turner were in *Performance*. The desert landscape of the film is similarly is not as anomalous as it seems. Roeg begins the film with establishing shots that show a bustling town invaded by patches of desert. Finally the camera tracks from a brick wall, an ordered image of civilisation to an expanse of barren desert, the wilderness that has taken over completely. This contrast establishes, albeit in a far faster way, the alien nature of the wilderness environment the two white children become lost in, just as the scenes of Chas at work emphasise how alien the world of the terrace in Notting Hill is to him. Furthermore, the desert of *Walkabout* is less that of Lean's *Lawrence of Arabia*¹⁵⁵ than it is an arid version of the treacherous 'Zone' in Andrei Tarkovsky's *Stalker* (1979), a science fiction landscape complete with ominously hissing lizards, blinding red sand and warped, misshapen trees that make it as strange, hostile and threatening to the white children as Turner's house - in which he, like the Aborigine in the wilderness, is entirely at home - is for Chas.

This clash between people - Chas and Turner, the girl and the aborigine - and between environments - Chas's well ordered bachelor pad and Turner's house, civilization and the wilderness - continues, in slightly varying ways, in Roeg's subsequent films. *Don't Look Now* and *Bad Timing* (1980), for example, place their Anglo-American lovers in the beautiful but oppressive terrain of Venice and Vienna respectively where they find themselves struggling to communicate. But perhaps the most literal example is that of Thomas Newton, the alien protagonist played by David Bowie in *The Man Who Fell to Earth*, who leaves his own drought-stricken planet in search of one with water, and lands on earth, where he encounters not only a strange

¹⁵⁵ Roeg acted as assistant to Cinematographer Freddie Young on the film, see Brownlow (1996:462-3; 468-9; 518-19).

terrain but an entirely different species, and like Chas he is seduced by it. Sex, drugs, alcohol and television soon corrupt his alien purity and he all but forgets his wife and child, who are dying of thirst on his home planet.

Criticism of British art cinema in the 1980s and early 1990s usually distinguishes between its two leading *auteurs* (and visualists), Jarman and Greenaway, by emphasising the passion of Jarman's work and accusing Greenaway of being cold and overly intellectual. A similar disparity can also be found in the work of British art cinema's two leading *auteurs* of the 1970s, with Russell sharing Jarman's reputation as a distinctly passionate director, whereas Roeg, like Greenaway, has often been accused of coldness and subjected to the very British criticism of being too clever.¹⁵⁶ For example, in his review of *Bad Timing* (1980), Chris Auty writes that 'the film seems a clear example of how more could have been achieved with less editing, less ingenuity, less even of the bravura intelligence' (Auty, 2002 (a): 70). There is a genuine need for the characters in Roeg's film to connect, to find some sort of human comfort or understanding in one another. However, in the best art film tradition of angst and alienation, these characters are better at thinking than feeling and the connections they make lead only to self-destruction, and more often than not to death. Such is the case in Chas' killing of Turner/himself in *Performance*, the aborigine's suicide after his mating ritual is rejected by the girl in *Walkabout*, Newton's moral bankruptcy at the end of *The Man Who Fell to Earth*, and Dr Alex Linden's *L'amour fou* for his patient Melina Flaherty that leads to acts of murder and, ultimately, necrophilia on his part.

However, in the case of *Don't Look Now*, based on the story by Daphne du Maurier, '[t]he flashy technique and dazzling style masks a strong undertow of

genuine feeling that has often been overlooked' (Sanderson, 1996: 9). Indeed, while *Don't Look Now* is both a very effective gothic thriller and modernist puzzle, it is also a very intimate and mature portrait of grief and marriage. Much was made at the time of the extended sex scene between the Baxters. Its purpose is clearly not to titillate or to court controversy and increase box office revenue. On the contrary, Roeg's subtle inter-cutting of the couple's love-making with their dressing for dinner, silent but smiling, shows a happily married couple going about the mundane details of their life, and indicates that the grief over the loss of their daughter has not damaged their relationship in any way. Establishing the couple's feelings for one another in this way is essential to making the remainder of the film work, as the climax, when John Baxter is killed by the dwarf in the red coat he has mistaken for his dead daughter, and sees his life - the whole of the film condensed into a two-minute montage - flash before his eyes, remains a touching moment, not just a display of technical virtuosity.

Despite the fact that Roeg and Russell continued to make films during the 1980s and 1990s neither filmmaker is commonly viewed as being part of the contemporary British art cinema that is the focus of this thesis.¹⁵⁷ Rather, they are seen as the forbearers of the movement, who demonstrated to filmmakers such as Jarman, Greenaway, Petit, Potter and Davies that a British art cinema was possible and even potentially commercially viable in Britain. Their exclusion from the movement they helped to foster is partly due to the fact that both filmmakers had largely done their best work by the mid-1970s. Russell and especially Roeg also had stronger ties to American cinema than the works of their successors. The work of both filmmakers received American and international distribution by major American

¹⁵⁶ See Lanza (1989: 11-12) and Hacker and Price (1991: 366).

¹⁵⁷ See, for example, Leach (1993: 203-17).

studios, such as MGM and Warner Brothers; Roeg typically cast notable American actors such as Donald Sutherland, Harvey Keitel and Gene Hackman, in lead roles in his films and one could argue that *The Man Who Fell to Earth* was the first American film made entirely with British money.¹⁵⁸

Why 1975?

As the main focus of this thesis is the emergence of a British art cinema in a European tradition, it will largely ignore the American-funded films of Roeg and Russell and instead concentrate on British art films that were funded largely by British, or at least British and European, sources. I have thus chosen the year 1975 specifically as the starting point for the main body of this thesis as it corresponds to the year Derek Jarman began work on his first feature film, *Sebastiane*,¹⁵⁹ and Peter Sainsbury was appointed head of the British Film Institute Production Board.¹⁶⁰ Both Jarman's work as a filmmaker and Sainsbury's work as a producer and mentor to fledgling feature filmmakers, such as Petit and Greenaway, were instrumental in changing the shape of British independent film in the late 1970s and early 1980s, paving the way for the emergence of a fully fledged art cinema in Britain.

It is tempting to view *Sebastiane* as little more than an eccentric footnote in British and indeed world cinema.¹⁶¹ Jarman's feature debut was an independently

¹⁵⁸ Although the film was British funded it was entirely shot in America, and, with the exception of David Bowie in the title role, with an all-American cast. See John Walker (1985 (b): 98).

¹⁵⁹ Although not premiered until July of 1976, Jarman had both begun and completed shooting the film in 1975. See Jarman (1984: 162-5) and Peake (1999: 225).

¹⁶⁰ See Ellis (1977: 64-5).

¹⁶¹ Patrick Robertson has noted that, at the time of its release, the film had, 'the unique distinction of being the only English film ever to be released in Britain with English subtitles' (1988: 151).

financed¹⁶² retelling of the story of Saint Sebastian and his martyrdom at the hands of the Romans for his Christianity, shot entirely in Vulgate Latin and released with English subtitles.¹⁶³ *Sebastiane* was however, a pivotal British film for a number of reasons.¹⁶⁴ Not only was it the first openly homoerotic British film, it was also, according to Tony Rayns, ‘[t]he most promising sign of new film life in independent narrative cinema in [Britain] in many, many years’ (see Walker, 1999: 729). Indeed the film’s appearance ‘[in] the mid seventies, with British cinema at an all time low’ (Peake, 1999: 236), could not have been more timely.¹⁶⁵

Although ‘the odds were formidably stacked against a film in Latin by an unknown director’ (Peake, 1999: 236), *Sebastiane* fared unexpectedly well at the box office. On its opening night at The Gate cinema in Notting Hill, ‘the queue for the first afternoon performance broke all house records’ (Peake, 1999: 237). It seemed as if

more doubtful distributors should have realised [...] that a film such as *Sebastiane*, cresting as it did the wave of gay liberation and featuring such an unfettered display of male nudity, would be essential viewing to a great many people (Peake, 1999: 237).

The film continued to fair well throughout its London release, and acted as an unlikely wake-up call to the ailing British film industry. It demonstrated to producers and distributors that a British art cinema was not only possible, but perhaps financially

¹⁶² See O’Pray 1996 (a): 80).

¹⁶³ It remained the only film to be shot in Latin until the release of Mel Gibson’s *The Passion of the Christ* (2002), which was shot in both Latin and Aramaic.

¹⁶⁴ See Walker (1985 (a): 236-8).

¹⁶⁵ O’Pray also notes that the film’s ‘casual narrative structure [...] Latin dialogue and blatant

sustainable, even potentially profitable.

In the wake of the film's release, and the similar *success de scandal* of Jarman's second feature, *Jubilee* (1977), which is commonly credited as 'Britain's first official punk movie' (Petrie, 2002: 596), came an increasing number of independently funded, low budget features such as Ron Peck's *Nighthawks* (1978), Alan Clarke's *Scum* (1979) and Claude Whatham's *Sweet William* (1979).¹⁶⁶ Therefore, I would contend that *Sebastiane* and *Jubilee* not only showed new signs of life in the independent sector of a waning British film industry, but that they also, in essence, kick-started the notion of a European style art cinema in Britain in the final quarter of the twentieth century.

With its references to the work of Fellini, and his *Satyricon* (1969) in particular, and strong echoes of Pasolini in its homoerotic content and 'amateur' style,¹⁶⁷ *Sebastiane* was a British film self-consciously cast in the mould of a certain type of European art cinema. There are of course, 'aspects of Jarman's work [like that of Pasolini] which made it difficult to appreciate within the conventional terms of art cinema criticism [not least their] apparent lack of [both] professional sheen [and] existential angst' (O'Pray, 1996 (c): 185), two of the key features of art cinema. But Jarman's early work, while critically problematic and controversial enough to earn him a six-year hiatus from feature film making,¹⁶⁸ nevertheless paved the way for more polished and thematically conventional British art films such as *Nighthawks* and *Radio On*. Essentially, the continental art-house impetus of Jarman's films facilitated a shift in independent British film by running counter to the

homoeroticism singled it out in British film at the time' (1996 (c): 179).

¹⁶⁶ Like *Jubilee*, these films were produced by Don Boyd. See Walker (1985 (a): 144-166).

concerns of the *Screen*-dominated film theory movement of the 1970s with its commitment to Hollywood and political modernism [which] viewed art cinema [as] a derogatory term typifying the bourgeois high art position, at odds with the popular culturalists of the New Left (O'Pray, 1996 (c): 185).

Indeed, it is doubtful that a film such as *Nighthawks*, another openly homoerotic British independent film, would have secured funding and distribution, had it not been for the relative success of Jarman's earlier films. Although the genesis of Peck's film began in 1974, when he was working with his independent filmmaking group, Four Corners Films, funding was not secured for the film until 1978,¹⁶⁹ after the release of both *Sebastiane* and *Jubilee* proved that there was a select but nevertheless potentially lucrative market for such small, transgressive films. *Nighthawks* focuses on Jim, a mild-mannered geography teacher at a comprehensive school, who by night cruises London's gay bars and discos in search of a meaningful relationship, only to find unfulfilling casual sex and an increasing sense of frustration. The film owes a debt to both *Sebastiane* and *Jubilee*¹⁷⁰ in its depictions of gay sexuality. It remains a milestone in British independent cinema in its own right for its authentic, realistic and direct examination of the lives of homosexuals in contemporary Britain and its keen sense of alienation and angst. In this respect, Peck's film differs greatly from the bulk of Jarman's work, which tended to approach contemporary issues in a more allegorical manner, and often featured an at least nominal period setting - as in *Sebastiane*, *Caravaggio*, *The Tempest*, *War Requiem*, *Edward II* and *Wittgenstein* - or

¹⁶⁷ See Viano (1993: 47-68) and O'Pray (1996 (c): 179).

¹⁶⁸ See O'Pray (1996 (c): 185-6).

¹⁶⁹ The final budget of the film was £60,000.

¹⁷⁰ Jarman's influence is cemented by his brief appearance in the film, in the one of the numerous disco scenes.

a more fantastical one - as in *Jubilee*, *The Angelic Conversation*, *The Last of England* and *The Garden*. Peck rather stayed closer to the traditions of both Italian and British cinematic realism, employing non-professional gay actors to play gay parts (whose own real-life experiences would inform the story and screenplay) and location shooting in many of London's most notorious gay hot-spots to lend the film an almost documentary quality often absent from Jarman's films. Peck's film is decidedly more British in tone and aesthetic than any offering by Jarman. *Nighthawks* is in the tradition of earlier British treatments of homosexuality, such as Basil Dearden's *Victim* (1961), a 'plea for a change in the [anti-gay] law[s]' (Walker, 1999: 882) in the British social-realist tradition, in which Dirk Bogarde's gay barrister is blackmailed for his transgressions.¹⁷¹ It is also an attack on the lack of honesty in such films¹⁷² or camp portrayal of 'queer' characters in comedies such as the *Carry On* films.¹⁷³

Much has been made of the influence of Jarman's and Peck's independent features of the 1970s on the subsequent Anglo-European phenomenon of 'New Queer Cinema' in the 1980s and 1990s, including films such as Frank Ripplloh's *Taxi Zum Klo* (1981),¹⁷⁴ Gus Van Sant's *Mala Noche* (1985), Todd Haynes' *Poison* (1990), Gregg Araki's *The Living End* (1992) and John Maybury's *Love is the Devil* (1998).¹⁷⁵ Their films have exerted an almost equal, although far less acknowledged influence over the direction British art cinema took in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Indeed, films such as *Sebastiane*, *Jubilee* and *Nighthawks* can be viewed as the catalyst which encouraged British cinematic institutions such as the British Film Institute, in the late

¹⁷¹ See Medhurst (1996: 117-32).

¹⁷² In Dearden's film homosexuals are throughout referred to as 'inverts' and the true nature of Bogarde's transgression is never explicitly mentioned.

¹⁷³ See Jordan (1983: 312-27) and Medhurst (1992: 13-15).

¹⁷⁴ Ripplloh's film, with its focus on the sex life of a German school teacher addicted to cruising the bars, clubs and toilets of Berlin, although semi-autobiographical, seems to owe much to *Nighthawks* in particular.

1970s and 1980s, under the direction of Sainsbury, to shift the focus of production ‘towards longer and more complex productions’ (Ellis, 1977: 65). These included feature length experimental works such as *The Song of the Shirt* and *The Falls*, as well as more narrative based and commercially orientated feature-length art films, such as Christ Petit’s *Radio On*, Pat Murphey’s *Maeve*, Menelik Shabazz’s *Burning an Illusion* (both 1981)¹⁷⁶ and Greenaway’s *The Draughtsman’s Contract* (1982).¹⁷⁷

The release of Chris Petit’s *Radio On*, for example, marked a shift in the output of the British Film Institute’s Production Board from primarily avant-garde films, often shorts, towards the production of more commercially viable low-budget features. It also set the precedent for European co-productions as a norm in British art cinema. *The Draughtsman’s Contract* would also prove to be pivotal in many ways. It not only established Greenaway as an international filmmaker, its success also vindicated Sainsbury’s decision to move the British Film Institute closer to the mainstream, and it marked the first collaboration between the British Film Institute and the then newly formed Channel Four.¹⁷⁸

The reasons for this collaboration stemmed from the increasing ambition of both Sainsbury and Greenaway. *The Draughtsman’s Contract* was the British Film Institute’s most expensive production to that date, costing around £200,000.¹⁷⁹ However, like the more modestly budgeted *Radio On* before it, the film was too costly for the Production Board to finance alone, but whereas Petit found the remainder of his budget from a foreign source, Wim Wender’s Road Movies Filmproduktion, Greenaway’s film attracted the interest of Jeremy Isaacs, then head of Channel Four.

¹⁷⁵ See Dyer and Pidduck (2002: 232-8).

¹⁷⁶ See Harvey (1986: 244-5).

¹⁷⁷ See Sainsbury (1981: 9-11); Park (1984: 73-75) and Hacker and Price (1991: 197-9).

¹⁷⁸ See Pym (1992) and Hill (2000: 20-2).

¹⁷⁹ See Brown (2000: 11).

who offered the British Film Institute a subvention of £280,000. £40,000 of this was allocated to the production of *The Draughtsman's Contract*, in return for the television rights of the resulting films. Robert Brown subsequently noted that Greenaway's film marked 'a hopeful sign for future cooperation between the British film and television industries' (2000: 11). Indeed, this collaboration would result in the production of some of the most critically successful and fascinating British films of the next decade that came to typify new art cinema in Britain, from Jarman's return to feature filmmaking, *Caravaggio* (1986), to Isaac Juliens's *Young Soul Rebels* (1991). However, Channel Four's support of the British Film Institute, which would increase to roughly £500,000 a year by 1985, marked a shift in the power structure of the independent wing of British cinema. The channel superseded the British Film Institute Production Board as the leading financier of independent films in Britain.

With this shift in the power structure, perhaps inevitably, there also came a change in direction. The British Film Institute had benefited from government subsidies, and therefore could afford to commit itself to 'work that [was] innovative in form, content, production method or the use of film and video technology' (Hill, 1999: 58), such as Greenaway's encyclopaedic experimental epic *The Falls* (1980). Channel Four on the other hand, was a commercial television channel, albeit one whose initial remit, as regards film, was to produce films 'on comparatively modest budgets [...] written and directed by established filmmakers and introducing new writing and directing talents' (Hill 1999: 56). It therefore had to rely on advertising revenue for its primary source of income. Ultimately, this meant that the channel required a certain commercial viability in the films it chose to finance, and the emphasis was on more accessible works such as Richard Eyre's *The Ploughman's Lunch* (1983) and Stephen Frears' *My Beautiful Laundrette* (1985), rather than on

more art-house orientated projects such as Bill Douglas' *Comrades* (1986) or Peter Wollen's *Friendship's Death* (1987).¹⁸⁰

One might argue that this shift from the government subsidised British Film Institute towards the more commercially motivated Channel Four was ultimately the downfall of art cinema in Britain, as the Channel, later spurred on by the unexpected international success of productions such as Mike Newell's *Four Weddings and a Funeral* (1993), began to move towards more artistically safe and commercially viable projects. Regardless of this fact, British cinema, in collaboration with British television and its continental counterparts still produced a high volume of films of unusual quality and artistic sophistication for more than a decade that collectively represented an almost unequalled highpoint for art cinema in Britain. This new British art cinema, as this thesis will demonstrate, in its duration, experimentation with the medium, and, most importantly, eclectic and varied styles, themes and concerns of individual directors, equals any of the great movements of post-war European art cinema. Indeed, as Sarah Street states, filmmakers such as Jarman, Greenaway, Petit, Davies and Potter, from vastly different perspectives 'introduced levels of formal and thematic experimentation which had been lacking in the two previous decades' (1997: 174) of British cinema. Indeed, the fusion of avant-garde techniques and more conventional aspects of European art cinema in the work of Jarman¹⁸¹ and Greenaway bears little relation to the more genre orientated works of Petit, the gender issues of Potter, the autobiographical concerns of Douglas and Davies, and the more traditional realism of Loach and Leigh. Yet, the work of these

¹⁸⁰ According to Ron Stoneman, Channel Four's relationship with the avant-garde was 'profoundly ambiguous' (1996: 285). See Stoneman (1996: 285-298); Ellis (1999: 158-9) and IFA (1999: 160-1).

¹⁸¹ As Peake notes, Jarman, in the mid-1970s, was fast becoming a recognised figure on the British avant-garde scene for his Super 8mm films and earlier in 1976, before the release of *Sebastiane*, he had been invited, as part of the Arts Council's new 'Film Makers on Tour' scheme, to be one of eight

filmmakers, and others, collectively, forms an art cinema as once as intangible and as interesting as the French *Nouvelle Vague*. Therefore, for the remainder of this thesis, I shall examine the varying relationships these filmmakers forged with several of the key aspects of both art cinema in general and British cinema as a specific phenomenon.

The first of these shall be the rather contested area of realism. While it may be somewhat reductive to argue that British cinema's 'reputation is for realism' (Williams, 1996: 190), this Chapter has demonstrated that '[m]any British films from different periods have engaged substantially with some of the conventions of artistic realism' (Williams, 1996: 190), including examples from the British Documentary Movement of the 1930s and 1940s, Free Cinema, the New Wave, the work of filmmakers included in this thesis, such as Loach and Leigh and more recent filmmakers such as Shane Meadows, Peter Mullan and Gary Oldman. However, contemporary British art cinema 'may be seen to include [...] the 'realism' of Ken Loach and Mike Leigh and the postmodern aesthetic experiments of Derek Jarman and Peter Greenaway' (1997: 247), who cast their work against this longstanding realist tradition, as well as the even more problematic work of Terence Davies which combines these realist and postmodern aesthetics in a highly personal and idiosyncratic way. Therefore, contemporary British art cinema, as the next Chapter shall demonstrate, has a highly complex relationship with realism and its central place in its nation's film industry.

British avant-garde filmmakers to screen his work at the ICA (Peake, 1999: 235).

**PAGE
MISSING
IN
ORIGINAL**

Chapter Two: Attitudes Towards Realism in British Art Cinema.

Perhaps no major national cinema has been as dominated throughout its history by realist modes of filmmaking as Britain's.¹ Other national film industries, such as Italy's in the mid-1940s and 1950s, have had periods where realism did come to dominate filmmaking practices. However, this 'neo-realist' movement, typified by the work of DeSica and Rosellini, soon morphed into the more modernist, stylised and theatrical work of the movement's younger filmmakers, such as Fellini, Antonioni and Bertolucci.² British cinema however, as the previous chapter suggested, has shown an almost consistent preoccupation with realism.³ Indeed, Julia Hallam has argued that

[one] way of interpreting the history of British cinema is to examine how both filmmakers and the critical machine have aimed to differentiate the British product from its Hollywood counterpart [and] realist aesthetics have been heavily implicated in this process of differentiation (2000: 33).

One could argue the same for British art cinema, which equally seeks to differentiate itself from the Hollywood mainstream, by aligning itself with the work of European forebears and contemporaries. However, there has been an equal tendency amongst some filmmakers working in contemporary British art cinema to attempt to

¹ See, for example, Murphy (1989); Hill (1986); Williams (1996: 190-1) and Lay (2002).

² See Kinder and Houston (1972: 246-57); Neale (2002: 111-119) and Bazin (2005 (b): 16-92).

³ Valerie Thorpe, for example, argued that British films in the 1990s such as *Riff-Raff* (1991), Gary Oldman's *Nil By Mouth* and Shane Meadows' *TwentyFourSeven* (both 1997) represent a renewed interest in social realist filmmaking that can be traced back to the 'New Wave' films of the late 1950s and 1960s; see Thorpe at http://film.guardian.co.uk/Feature_Story/Observer/0,,52399,00.html. Hill disputes this claim, arguing that Thorpe is 'too eager to identify this as a relatively unbroken tradition and to run together differing forms of film-making practice' (2000 (c): 249). Samantha Lay however, argues that 'British cinema has indeed had an enduring preoccupation with social realism [which] has been a major mode of expression in British screen culture that continues to this day' (2002: 1-2).

differentiate their work from that of the realist tradition that has existed in British cinema - in one form or another - since the days of John Grierson and the British Documentary Movement.⁴

Filmmakers such as Jarman and Greenaway, for example, at 'no point in their careers [adopted] British mainstream realism' (Rees, 1999: 99). However, there are equally filmmakers operating within the sphere of contemporary British art cinema whose work bears the hallmarks of the British realist tradition.⁵ The films of Ken Loach⁶ and Mike Leigh⁷ for example, share a concern with addressing social issues and presenting performances, characters, and locations that are recognisable from material reality and favour these aspects over the technical qualities and postmodern referentialism preferred by filmmakers such as Jarman and Greenaway.⁸ It is tempting then, to argue that the British art cinema can be neatly divided into two diametrically opposing camps: the realist, as typified by the work of Loach and Leigh and a counter-tradition typified by Jarman and Greenaway, which can be characterised by its 'thoroughgoing anti-realism' (Rees, 1999: 99).⁹ But such an argument is only supportable up to a point, as the relationship the filmmakers in the both camps have

⁴ See Hacker and Price (1991: 234) and Woods (1996: 164-73).

⁵ See Hill (1997: 245-6) and Higson (1998: 504).

⁶ Loach, in many ways, remains the figurehead in contemporary realist British cinema. Graham Fuller argues that recent British realist films such as *Brassed Off*, *Under the Skin*, *Nil by Mouth*, *TwentyFourSeven* and *The Full Monty* represent a 'diaspora of Loach's cinema [and are] hugely indebted' (1998: x) to his work.

⁷ Like the common pairing of Jarman and Greenaway, Loach and Leigh are often mentioned together by film critics, despite clear differences in their thematic concerns and filmmaking style. Armstrong, for example, dedicated a sub-chapter in his book, *Understanding Realism*, to the pair and argues that Loach's films are 'shaped by wide shots, long takes, naturalistic acting and the looser exposition of documentary. Locating identifiable feelings in an identifiable Britain lends Loach's films the apparent patina of everyday working life' (2005: 97), while Leigh's work 'also embodies loose structure and an unobtrusive use of camerawork and editing. But here the emphasis is on a survey of personality and familial and social interactions' (2005: 97). Leigh's biographer, Michael Coveney, has however argued that this frequent comparison is little more than a 'sloppy generalisation' (1997: 13).

⁸ Wendy Everett argues that qualities such as 'self-consciousness' and 'formal complexity' are the 'very qualities which were traditionally used to define 'art' film as the antithesis of realism' (2004: 59-60). See also Neale (2002: 103-105).

⁹ Everett refers to this as the 'realist/formalist dichotomy' in British art cinema (2004: 89).

with realism is ultimately more complex.

For example, as the last chapter indicated, films such as *The Last of England* and *The Falls* can be viewed as direct descendants of the more experimental facets of the British Documentary Movement, especially the work of Jennings.¹⁰ Additionally, the films of Terence Davies operate in an even more problematic space between British ‘kitchen sink’ realism and the modernist narrative devices and postmodernist irony and referentialism the former conventionally rejects.¹¹ The purpose of this chapter is not to argue the superiority of one or the other of these traditions of contemporary British art filmmaking, but rather to illustrate the complexity of individual British filmmaker’s relationship with the realism that has come to be viewed as typical of British cinema. Before one can do this however, one must first briefly define the term ‘realism’ and examine its place in cinema.

Cinematic Realism.

The ties between cinema and the notion of realism are as old as the medium itself.¹² For example, the early cinematic pioneers, Louis and Auguste Lumière, referred to their first and most famous shorts, *La Sortie des Usines Lumière* and *L’Arrivée d’un Train en Gare de la Ciotat* (both 1895), not as films, but as ‘actualités’,¹³ a term which implies both truthfulness and topicality.¹⁴ Since then.

¹⁰ Jarman referred to *The Last of England* as a ‘documentary [...] from somewhere far away’ (1987: 170). See also Kuhn (1995: 104-21) and Bersani and Dutoit (1999: 61-2)

¹¹ Everett, for example, argues that ‘if it is important to recognise [Davies’] debt to the British documentary tradition or to Ealing comedies, it is equally or more important to recognise the extent to which his films reflect past and current trends in European cinema’ (2004: 2) especially the work of Bergman, Resnais and Antonioni. See also Andrew (1989: 73).

¹² See Kracauer (1960: 30-36).

¹³ See also Adair (1995: 5); Chanan (1996: 117) and Armstrong (2005: 131).

¹⁴ The term is still used in France to describe both topical news programmes and film news reels.

many influential and formative film critics and theorists, such as Siegfried Kracauer¹⁵, Béla Balázs¹⁶, and André Bazin¹⁷, and theorist-filmmakers such as Maya Deren¹⁸, have argued for cinema's unique and innate ability to mirror material reality.¹⁹ However, can film, as Balázs stated, ultimately 'show everything the way it is' (see Graf, 2002: 22) and can realism, as Kracauer would have it, be defined as a certain aesthetic, which has the facility to capture 'everyday life in the manner of photographs' (Kracauer, 1960: 30)? Some contemporary British critics, such as Graham Fuller, would seem to affirm this position, arguing that the films of Loach succeed in 'paint[ing] life as it is' (1998: ix). Indeed, as Hallam notes, the style of Loach's films, for example, has 'become synonymous with what is commonly known as social realism' (2000: 210) in their general rejection of

generic narratives,²⁰ formal virtuosity, and postmodern eclecticism in favour of a plain visual style that emphasises performance, the development of character and the pre-filmic referentiality of situations and events (Hallam, 2000: 210).²¹

However, Richard Armstrong notes that, 'in the cinema, there is no such thing as realism per se [and] rather than standing for a particular aesthetic, realism exists on a sort of sliding scale, each gradation of which is defined by the realism which came

¹⁵ See *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality* (1960).

¹⁶ See *Theory of the Film: Character and Growth of a New Art* (1952).

¹⁷ See *What is Cinema? Vol 1* (2005 (a): 9-22) and *Vol 2* (2005 (b): 16-82).

¹⁸ See 'Cinematography: The Creative Use of Reality' (2004: 216-27)

¹⁹ See also Arnheim (1958) and Montagu (1964: 279-95).

²⁰ Jacob Leigh has disputed the idea that Loach rejects generic elements in his films, especially in his work of the 1990s (see Leigh 2002: 169). A more detailed examination of the generic elements in Loach's films shall follow in Chapter Three.

²¹ For a detailed examination of Loach's filmmaking style see Fuller (1998: 38-42).

before and went after it' (2005: ix-x).²²

Realism then, remains a 'conundrum' (Armstrong, 2005: 1), a commonly contested term in film theory and criticism, which 'comes [...] heavily laden with millennial encrustations from antecedent debates in philosophy and literature' (Stam, 2000: 15),²³ which 'seeks to depict real objects and real experience [yet] the term is as much about representation as it is about reality' (Armstrong, 2005: 1). Therefore, the relative appearance of reality, or *verisimilitude*, of a film is determined by the presence of what the French theorist Roland Barthes called 'reality effects'²⁴, which signify the way in which the representations in a film mirror the material world which surrounds us²⁵ and 'truth effects', which 'signify how far representations chime with our ideas of what is true about the world in a general sense' (Armstrong, 2005: 9). Therefore, a film by Loach may appear more realistic to a viewer than a film by Greenaway due to its use of authentic props, costumes and locations (reality effects) and authentic accents, dialects and actions on the part of the actors (truth effects).²⁶ However, the *verisimilitude* of a text is also relative and subjective and will differ from one member of an audience to the next. For example, a viewer familiar with the

²² While the films of the Lumière brothers were in many ways intended as documents, capturing the reality of life 'unawares', the films of their contemporary and compatriot Georges Méliès, such as *Le Voyage dans la Lune* (1902) stressed artistic imagination, experimentation and playfulness with the medium over the need for an objective depiction of reality (see Kracauer, 1960: 28-32). Yet, despite the innumerable changes undergone in the film industry since these early days, the division between these two schools of filmmaking can still be useful to the contemporary critic. Indeed, the divisions between the work of Lumière and Méliès echo the two similar traditions that can be identified in contemporary British art cinema, with the work of filmmakers such as Loach and Leigh bearing comparison to the realistic tradition preferred by Lumière and the work of Jarman and Greenaway echoing the more imaginative, artistic and fantastic work of Méliès.

²³ Colin MacCabe notes, '[o]ne of the difficulties of any discussion about realism is the lack of any really effective vocabulary with which to discuss the topic. Most discussions turn on the problems of the production of discourse which will fully adequate the real. This notion of adequacy is accepted both by the realists and indeed the anti-realists whose main argument is that no discourse can ever be adequate to the multifarious nature of the real' (1981: 217). MacCabe also argues that conventional notions of realism are 'tied to a particular type of literary production - the nineteenth century realist novel' (1981: 217) and many theories regarding cinematic realism indeed owe much to studies of literary realism such as Erich Auerbach's *Mimesis* (1953) and Barthes' 'The Reality Effect' (1968).

²⁴ See Barthes (1986: 141-8).

fashions and couture of seventeenth-century England would recognise that the costumes and wigs worn by characters in a film such as Greenaway's *The Draughtsman's Contract* were exaggerated and 'very stylised' (Gras and Gras, 2000: xiv), whereas a viewer less familiar with the period may regard the ostentatious wigs and frills worn by the characters as accurate representations of Restoration dress and see them as realistic and authentic recreations.

As I noted earlier in this chapter, British art cinema in the period 1975-2000 can potentially be divided into two opposing traditions: the realism of Loach and Leigh and the anti-realism of Jarman and Greenaway. However, just as it is impossible to mirror the complexities of material reality on film, it is equally impossible for a filmmaker seeking to make an anti-realist work to divorce himself completely from reality. All films, whatever their artistic intent, both engage with and make claims about reality.²⁷ This engagement may only be slight. A certain residue of material reality that remains in an otherwise entirely fantastical or abstract work, such as the appearance of a human form, a recognisable setting or prop, or a familiar language system, but a certain level of realism is there nevertheless. Anti-realism cannot however be as easily defined by a set of artistic conventions as realism. It refers to any work of art that seeks, in one way or another, to reject or contravene those artistic conventions that have become culturally established as signifiers of reality in art.²⁸

While it is impossible for a film not to engage with and comment upon

²⁵ See Armstrong (2005: 8).

²⁶ See Armstrong (2005: 133).

²⁷ See Armstrong (2005: 31-2).

²⁸ Anti-realism is a broad term which encompasses those movements and individual works of art which are 'animated by a rejection of the conventionality of late-nineteenth-century realism' (Armstrong, 2005: 102) which has come to dominate cinema. Therefore, anti-realism can be extended to include modernist movements such as Expressionism and Surrealism and several film by Jarman and

material reality in some way, reality in cinema is not a simple mimetic mirroring of the physical world some critics have seen it as, but rather a set of media-induced technological conventions, such as ‘invisible’ editing and ‘inaudible’ music, linear narratives, realistic settings, period detail and seemingly authentic characters and dialogue which have become naturalised in the perceptions of film spectators.²⁹ Films that do not conform to these culturally perceived notions of what constitutes reality in cinema, regardless of their potentially greater resemblance to temporal and spatial complexities of material reality, may well be viewed as anti-realist.³⁰ Having determined that both ‘realism’ and ‘anti-realism’ are imperfect and somewhat misleading terms it is possible to focus attention on the attitudes of several leading British art filmmakers towards reality in their work. To do this I shall briefly examine a number of factors in a film that can potentially create or destroy an illusion of reality, such as a film’s *mise-en-scène*, including its camera-work, lighting and set design, as well as the use of music and various acting styles.

Realism and *Mise-En-Scène*.

The ways in which the *mise-en-scène* of a film, which is to say everything that is presented on screen in a single scene - from props and costume design to setting and the positioning of actors³¹ - can either create or destroy the illusion of reality are too

Greenaway. See also (Jones, 2000: 187).

²⁹ As Bazin noted ‘[c]lassical editing, deriving from Griffith, separated reality into successive shots which were just a series of either logical or subjective points of view of an event [...] The construction thus introduces an obviously abstract element into reality. Because we are so used to such abstractions, we no longer sense them’ (Bazin, 2002: 56).

³⁰ For example, recent films such as Mike Figgis’ *Timecode* (2000) and Alexandr Sokurov’s *Russian Ark* (2002), which are shot in unbroken takes in ‘real time’, are viewed as being experimental works despite their stronger relation to temporal reality than conventionally realist films. See Armstrong (2005: 88).

³¹ See Bordwell and Thompson (2004: 176-7).

many to list or analyse here. However, a few carefully selected examples from contemporary British art cinema can help to illustrate some of the fundamental differences between its opposing realist and anti-realist traditions.

It is worth noting at this point that realism is essentially a conservative branch of cinema and art in general that commonly seeks to reproduce the *status quo*, the material world as it is.³² Aesthetically speaking, this is the case with the work of Loach, and (perhaps to a slightly lesser extent) Leigh, who each has a filmmaking style that is conservative and classical, and favours many of the technological conventions that have become culturally accepted as realistic. For example, Loach's approach to blocking actors and positioning props is, by his own admission, 'very straightforward' (Fuller, 1998: 40), with an eye towards retaining a naturalistic feel to each scene and the camera is placed 'in such a way as it doesn't inhibit the actor' (Fuller, 1998: 41). Therefore, the camera in Loach's films is generally kept at a distance from the actors and action and takes 'up a fixed position' (Fuller, 1998: 41). Loach also prefers the camera to remain static or to pan rather than track, thus allowing the actors a greater freedom to improvise actions and movement (Fuller, 1998: 40-2). For instance, Jacob Leigh refers to the sequence in *Raining Stones* in which Bob (Bruce Jones) asks his friend Tommy (Ricky Tomlinson) for a favour outside the Job Centre as 'a characteristic Loach shot' (2002: 144). The camera takes on a purely observational role here and the pair are filmed in a long shot from 'the opposite side of the road' (Leigh, 2002: 144) with the camera panning to follow their movements as they walk. Furthermore, Leigh notes the 'significant absence of dialogue' (2002: 144) in this scene. The soundtrack is rather dominated by both Stuart Copland's score and diegetic sounds of the passing traffic. In one respect

Loach's decision to leave the dialogue unheard is designed to underline the tension of the scene - as it transpires that Bob's favour is to ask Tommy to give him the name of a local lone shark - but it also conforms to Loach's avowed preference for naturalism³³ as Bob and Tommy's conversation would indeed be drowned out by the sound of traffic in material reality were a person observing them from the same position as Loach's camera.

However, while one is almost never aware of the camera in Loach's films, in Leigh's work it sometimes calls attention to itself through occasional virtuoso sequences, which often feature an extended single take several minutes in length. For example, the centrepiece of the extended sequence in *Naked* (1993), in which the protagonist, Johnny (David Thewlis), explains his theories about the end of the world to a lonely security guard, Brian (Peter Wight), is a single shot presenting the two characters in silhouette,³⁴ which slowly dollies closer to the two figures as Johnny's apocalyptic rant and Andrew Dickson's accompanying music build to a crescendo. The scene is quite at odds with anything in Loach's work and indeed much of Leigh's own earlier films. Leigh rather eschews naturalism³⁵ in favour of a more self-conscious aesthetic designed to heighten the both the dramatic impact and inherent darkness and pessimism of Johnny's theories.³⁶ It is this newfound aestheticism that makes *Naked* such a pivotal film in Leigh's oeuvre and led Geoff Andrew to comment that the film was 'by far [Leigh's] most cinematic' (Andrew (g), 2002: 799).³⁷

³² See MacCabe (1981: 216-35) and Hallam (2000: xii).

³³ See Hacker and Price (1991: 300), Lovell (1997: 237) and Lawrenson (2005: 45-6).

³⁴ See Leigh (1995: 44-5).

³⁵ Leigh has argued that 'none of [his] films are really naturalistic [but] they are - according to the classical definition - exercises in realism' (Leigh, 1995: xxxvii).

³⁶ See Leigh (1995: xxix).

³⁷ Leigh somewhat disagrees with this claim and argues that *Naked* is no more 'cinematic than *Life is Sweet* or, indeed, *Grown-Ups* [but] [i]t's maybe more *epic*, and it's certainly more visually extreme' (Leigh, 1995: xxxix). Coveney echoes Andrews however, claiming that *Naked* 'stands monumentally alone in the *oeuvre* as an intellectual and cinematic *tour de force*' (1997: xix).

Coveney notes that the ‘use of a static camera is one of Leigh’s mature skills’ (1997: xx) and highlights ‘two significantly long ‘takes’’ (1997: xx) in *Secrets and Lies* as notable examples of Leigh’s filmmaking style. The first, in which the character Hortense (Marianne Jean-Baptiste) meets her birth mother, Cynthia (Brenda Blethyn), for the first time in an Holborn café, is notable for several reasons, not least that it lasts over nine minutes without recourse to a single cut.³⁸ However, it again demonstrates the way in which Leigh occasionally compromised the appearance of reality for aesthetic reasons. In the shot, Hortense and Cynthia sit side by side, both facing the camera. This, as some critics have pointed out, is an unlikely seating arrangement, especially for two people who have never met (see Coveney, 1997: xx). However, this reaction is at once a testament to the level of authenticity and *verisimilitude* Leigh managed to capture in his film up to this point, for one could only question the inherent realism of placing the actors side by side if one ‘had been so drawn into the reality of the characters that [one was] prepared to overlook the fact that they are appearing in a film’ (Coveney, 1997: xx). Furthermore, it is an example of what Leigh calls the ‘heightened realism’³⁹ of his film. This ‘heightened realism’ Leigh employs allows for a certain restrained aestheticism in his films, eschewing a visual style slavishly concerned with a naturalistic mirroring of reality. In this way his films - albeit in a far less self-conscious manner than that of Jarman, Greenaway and Davies – is ultimately aware of its status as a film and fictional construction. Indeed, the café scene ‘is memorable precisely because they *are* sitting next to each other [their conversation] unimpeded by a moving camera’ (Coveney, 1997: xx) or a more conventional shot/reverse shot construction.

³⁸ See Coveney (1997: xx).

³⁹ Leigh refers to this term frequently in his commentaries on the DVD releases of *Topsy-Turvy* (Pathe.

Much the same can be said for the second static long take Coveney singles out in the film: the barbeque scene which proceeds the climax birthday party sequence. The shot is notably 'realistic' in a number of ways and conforms to the type of cinematic realism preferred by Bazin in both its use of the long take and deep-focus.⁴⁰ For Bazin, montage, whether it was the associative montage of Soviet cinema or Hollywood-style continuity cutting, was 'always a telling or ordering of events to suit rhetorical ends' (Hallam, 2000: 14). Long takes combined with deep focus, on the other hand, seemed to him to 'respect perceptual space and time' (Hallam, 2000: 15). For example, by avoiding cutting, the barbeque scene is allowed to play out in 'real time', as the actors eat, drink and talk as they would in material reality. Furthermore, deep-focus allows the viewer to take in 'with equal sharpness the whole field of vision contained simultaneously within the dramatic field' (Bazin, 2002: 56).⁴¹ With neither editing nor changes of focus directing their attention, the spectator is therefore at liberty to concentrate on the entire dramatic spectrum of the scene. The seven characters in the scene are allowed to interact without any one of them being especially favoured and Maurice (Timothy Spall), who is at the barbeque behind the other six, manages to be 'vividly of the group yet standing apart' (Coveney, 1997: xxi).

Ultimately, however, while Leigh's films are all in some way exercises in

2000) and *All or Nothing* (Optimum, 2004).

⁴⁰ See Bazin (2002: 56-63) and (2005 (a): 16-40).

⁴¹ In more detail, Bazin, who was specifically referring to Orson Welles' use of deep focus in *Citizen Kane*, noted that the technique:

takes in with equal sharpness the whole field of vision contained simultaneously within the dramatic field. It is no longer the editing that selects what we see [...] it is the mind of the spectator which is forced to discern, as a sort of parallelepiped of reality with the screen as its cross-section, the dramatic spectrum proper to the scene [...] the depth of focus lens [thus] restored to reality its visible continuity (2002: 56-7).

realism, they are also concerned with telling a dramatic story. Therefore, these two extended takes are somewhat exceptional moments in the film, which is otherwise comprised of far shorter single-take scenes and continuity-style editing. After the barbeque scene, for instance, Leigh moves the action inside for the climax and begins to edit the film in a more conventional way, cutting 'between big close-ups and shots in which a foreground figure is in focus and a second person behind them slightly out of focus' (Coveney, 1997: xxi). However, the long take/deep focus style of filmmaking preferred by Bazin and employed by Leigh in the barbeque scene would not be suitable for the numerous personal revelations of the climax, where the dramatic power of individual close-ups, while inherently less realistic, would be preferable to a more observational, objective camera.

Whatever manipulation of reality may be inherent in Leigh's films, his style 'never draws attention to itself' (Coveney, 1997: xxi) in the way that the style of a filmmaker such as Jarman does. For example, Leigh shot the café sequence in *Secrets and Lies* in an actual café in Holborn, with seemingly natural lighting and authentically mundane décor - right down to the cheap white tea mugs and aluminium ashtrays. This creates a strong and believable reality effect for the viewer. Jarman, on the other hand, even in his more conventional films, consciously subverts conventional notions of cinematic realism. For example, he emphasises the fact that both *Caravaggio* and *Edward II* were shot in a studio⁴² rather than in an authentic location. Furthermore, the sparse sets often contain only a single prop, such as a bed, a table or throne.⁴³ These solitary objects in otherwise empty grey rooms no longer serve their common purpose as reality effects, rather, they constitute a 'non-reality'

⁴² The films were shot at in a London Docklands Warehouse and Bray Studios respectively.

⁴³ For more on Jarman's 'less is more' approach to set design, and his collaborations with art director

effect, as such sparsely decorated rooms would be less likely to exist in material reality.⁴⁴

Furthermore, both films contain frequent anachronisms in dialogue⁴⁵, costume design and props, which act as alienating devices and disrupt the viewer's sense of period. *Caravaggio*, for example, although set in seventeenth-century Italy, features a costume design almost exclusively made up of twentieth-century clothing and a production design which showcases motorcycles, pocket calculators, cigarettes and the like.⁴⁶ If, according to Bersani and Dutoit, 'Jarman's jolting anachronisms [...] seem like rather crude attacks on an audience's willingness to go along with conventional realistic deceptions' (1999: 9), motivated on one level by Jarman's disdain for costume drama⁴⁷, they also serve a more serious purpose. Ultimately, Jarman rejected claims that it was 'either possible or useful' (Bersani and Dutoit, 1999: 9) to represent or re-create either the past or indeed material reality itself successfully in art. Therefore,

Christopher Hobbs, see Jarman (1986: 15-6).

⁴⁴ Jarman took this minimalism to extremes in his penultimate film, *Wittgenstein* (1993), which was entirely shot on a soundstage, without even any visible walls, just a black background and a series of highly theatrical lighting effects, such as spotlights, to light individual characters or scenes. This film, like Hans Jürgen Syberberg's *Hitler: A Film from Germany* (1977), which was also shot on a single sound stage and only used back projection to imply a change in scenery, manages on this one aesthetic level to divorce itself from material reality almost entirely. However, like Syberberg's film, *Wittgenstein* still contains aspects of material reality through its use of authentic costumes and the casting of a lead actor who bears a strong resemblance to the real-life protagonist.

⁴⁵ For example, in *Caravaggio*, the character of Ranuccio, played by Sean Bean, uses expressions such as 'fucking brilliant' and speaks with a strong Newcastle accent. Similarly, Lightborne (Keith Collins), the executioner in *Edward II* also speaks with a strong Newcastle accent and uses modern colloquial expression such as 'lugs' instead of ears.

⁴⁶ In *Edward II*, Jarman, production designer Christopher Hobbs and costume designer Sandy Powell again fill the film with anachronistic props and costumes such as rifles, Coca-cola cans, cigarettes and tuxedos, to provide 'deliberately jarring reminders of late twentieth-century culture and politics' (Bersani and Dutoit, 1999: 8), and forge a direct link between Marlowe's play and the state of modern Britain, and in particular, queer Britain under Thatcher. Colin MacCabe has argued that from a design point of view *Edward II* 'triumphantly realise[d] what was only hinted at in *Caravaggio*: a world which is always now and then (both twentieth and sixteenth century) but is always England' (1996: 196). See also Jarman (1991) and (1992), Hawks (1996: 103-16) and MacCabe (1996: 191-201).

⁴⁷ Jarman's disdain for British costume dramas and so-called 'Heritage' cinema is well documented. In *Queer Edward II*, the published screenplay of *Edward II*, he referred to costume drama as 'a delusion based on furnishing fabrics. (Lurex for an Oscar)' (1991: 86). See also Jarman (1986: 185-7). For further discussion of British costume drama and 'Heritage' cinema and its associations with realism see Higson (1996: 232-48) and Hill (1999: 73-98).

Jarman's films sought to challenge the complacency with which British filmmakers, critics and audiences accepted and even favoured the notion of film as a medium which reflected reality 'as it is'.

For example, Jarman wrote that he 'tried to create every aspect of the film in the ambiance of the paintings' (Jarman, 1986: 22). To this effect, he and Mexican director of photography Gabriel Berisain lit each scene in the innovative style of Caravaggio's paintings, which rejected natural light in favour of more dramatic 'dark interiors with bodies partially illuminated by shafts of sunlight or beams of artificial light from sources placed high up, penetrating the depicted space from beyond the framing edge' (Walker, 1996: 63). In short, the look of the film seeks to echo the chiaroscuro lighting in Caravaggio's work, which Jarman saw as being both proto-cinematic and anti-naturalistic.⁴⁸ Indeed, as Wymer notes, 'had [Caravaggio] been more strictly naturalistic, Jarman would not have admired him so much' (2005: 95). Furthermore, Jarman chose to construct the film largely as a series of *tableaux vivants*, almost never moving the camera, as if to 'compose the screen image like an oil painting by Caravaggio' (Walker, 1996: 63). The very look of the film then, through its studio setting, artificial lighting and borrowing of the aesthetics of Renaissance painting, is decidedly stylised and anti-realist.

Lighting however, can just as easily be used to create a reality effect as much as destroy the illusion of reality. For example, Davies' *Distant Voices, Still Lives* and Leigh's *Vera Drake* (2004), both of which are set in 1950s Britain, use lighting to help evoke the period in a more realistic and authentic way. The colour palates chosen in both films are a drab selection of brown and green tones, reflecting the austere and

⁴⁸ Jarman wrote in the published screenplay that 'whatever claims have been made for "realism" by art historians [the] progress in his work is away from reality' (1986: 22). See also Jarman (1986: 22-44)

somewhat colourless lives of the British working classes in the years following the Second World War. Davies, who takes the conceit of 'period' lighting to an almost hyper-real level in *Distant Voices, Still Lives*, employed a 'bleach by-pass process' to give every shot a murky sepia tone, as if the film's negative had been tobacco stained (see Falsetto, 1999: 78). This was intended by Davies not only to reflect the lack of strong colours in his childhood home, but also the appearance of photographs from the period of the kind his family might have taken.⁴⁹

Perhaps more than any contemporary British filmmaker, Davies' attitude towards realism is ambiguous and problematic. On one level, his films seem to fall into the realist category of British art cinema.⁵⁰ Their examination of underprivileged working-class life is in keeping with the social realist agenda⁵¹, and the careful use of period detail in the costumes, sets and even, as I shall show below, music, creates a strong reality effect.⁵² Yet, as Everett notes, 'any reading of the film[s] exemplifying social realism were forced to take account of both [their] extreme self-consciousness and formal complexity' (2004: 59). Therefore, on another level, the highly-stylised photograph-like images, the non-linear dream-like narratives and the refusal to address any wider social issues 'position his work irrevocably in the context of British art cinema' (Everett, 2004: 89). Furthermore, the reality effects in his films also verge on the hyper-real; the brown palate in *Distant Voices, Still Lives* is almost too brown,⁵³ the streets and houses (recreated in a studio) in *The Long Day Closes* feature

and Nowell-Smith (1996: unnumbered still).

⁴⁹ See Everett (2004: 72-81).

⁵⁰ The 'film appeared to fulfil the widely accepted criteria of 'realism': deep focus, long shots, location filming, social subject matter, northern working-class setting [and] lack of stars' (Everett, 2004: 59).

⁵¹ As Everett notes, at the time of the release of *Distant Voices, Still Lives*, its depiction of 'harrowing memories and minutely detailed domestic setting, encouraged critics to locate it within the British documentary or realist tradition' (2004: 59).

⁵² Everett argues that the key contributions to the 'the film's sense of period authenticity [are] *mise-en-scene*, colour and music' (2004: 75).

⁵³ Ken Russell jokingly said the film was 'as brown as a Hovis loaf' (1993: 168).

oversized paving stones and fence spikes, as if they were being looked at from a small child's point of view. Thus, Davies consciously over-uses reality effects in his films to create a sense of the unreal, as he is not trying to show us the 1950s as they actually were⁵⁴ but how they exist in the reality of his and his family's memory. For Davies, however, this idea of memory as reality seems to be the most valid way to present the past in art, as the past can never actually be objectively recreated once it is gone.⁵⁵ In this respect, Davies illustrates the essential subjectivity of reality more clearly than any other British filmmaker, and challenges perceived notions about the depiction of both realism and period setting in film. Davies' films then are at once realist and self-reflexive, depicting a reality in the normalised sense of the term but also declaring their own artifice to the viewer.

Many British critics are suspicious of art films however, and view them as 'aesthetic, inauthentic and self-indulgent [and entirely in opposition to] a gritty, realistic and authentic work in the tradition of British documentary' (Everett, 2004: 89). It is therefore unsurprising that the reaction to Davies' unique blending of realist and anti-realist devices was at times far from positive, and his autobiographical films have come under attack from British critics who see their more aesthetic and formal qualities as a betrayal of the British Social Realist tradition. Indeed, as Everett notes, a typical response to *Distant Voices, Still Lives* was to 'view the non-realistic elements [...] as a fundamental flaw in its make-up [and] [a]lmost every analysis of the critical reception accorded to [the film] struggle[s] to resolve the apparent conflict between its realist and formal characteristics' (2004: 60). Yet while there remains an inability amongst British critics to reconcile the mixture of realism and art cinema in Davies'

⁵⁴ See Kennedy (1988: 16).

⁵⁵ See Kuhn (1995: 160-1).

work, this combination still presents an important challenge to the commonly held critical 'idea of a pristine "realist" tradition' of British cinema and has perhaps rendered it 'an unworkable fallacy' (Orr, 1993: 47).

A more straightforward rejection of the conventions of British cinematic realism can be found in the work of Jarman and Greenaway. In Greenaway's work, for example, one is constantly being reminded of the fact that one is watching a film. He has argued that 'it's impossible for cinema to be a window to the world [or] a slice of life' (Klib, 2000: 61). Therefore, he asserts that he is 'only interested in works of art that are self-aware of their artificiality [...] everything that I do is self-reflexive in this sense, filled with signs which emphasise the artificiality of the action' (Klib, 2000: 61). This position, which is similar to that held by Godard and the late Pasolini,⁵⁶ suggests that films that openly demonstrate the artificiality of their construction paradoxically present a more truthful reflection of reality than those films that conform to the normalised idea of what is 'realistic' in film. As Greenaway sees it, realist films, by directors such as Loach and Leigh, are as self-conscious in their construction as his own. The actors' movements and those of the camera carefully determined, blocked and rehearsed with equal care before shooting, and the film's final form is also determined through careful editing. Realist filmmakers however, attempt to choreograph, shoot and edit their films in a manner that hides, rather than foregrounds, this careful construction, thus lending their film an ultimately deceitful veneer of *verisimilitude*.⁵⁷

Formally, Jarman and Greenaway's work demonstrates the 'stress on visual style' (Neale, 2002: 103-4) that Neale identifies as a key feature of art cinema.

⁵⁶ See Woods (1996: 170); Wollen (2000: 74-83); Buchholz and Kuenzel (2000: 51) and Viano (1993).

Furthermore, both have made claims to wish to bring the aesthetics of painting to the cinema.⁵⁸ On the most superficial level, this involves Jarman's imitation of the painter's visual style for *Caravaggio* and Greenaway's similar borrowings from the work and lighting style of Vermeer for *A Zed and Two Noughts*⁵⁹ or Frans Hals' for *The Cook, The Thief, His Wife and Her Lover*.⁶⁰ Additionally, both attempt to bring the aesthetics of their films closer to those of painting rather than conventional still photography, frequently employing what Rees called 'image manipulation' (Rees, 1999: 101) in the process. To this end, Jarman, as I shall detail more in Chapter Four, rejected the common 35mm film format preferred by industrial cinema, which he found 'static and cumbersome' (O'Pray, 1996 (d): 70), in favour of the use of traditionally amateur equipment such as Super 8. As O'Pray notes, '[t]he lightness [...] and cheapness [of Super 8 cameras] allowed Jarman to work quickly and intuitively in ways akin to painting itself. He was able to explore formal techniques, especially superimpositions and refilming at different speeds' (O'Pray, 1996 (d): 70), which created an imagistic and sometimes abstract visual style. Greenaway, on the other hand, began innovating with computer-generated images and graphics in the late 1980s and 1990s. However, while Hollywood filmmakers often use computer-generated effects to increase a film's sense of *verisimilitude*,⁶¹ Greenaway uses the technology to create 'digital abstractions' (Rees, 1999: 101) that interfere with his films' resemblance to reality.

The first work in which Greenaway pioneered his technique of superimposing a variety of images onto the screen, in increasingly small frames of varying-aspect

⁵⁷ See Buchholz and Kuenzel (2000: 51).

⁵⁸ See Hacker and Price (1991: 187-270); Walker (1993: 58-69; 112-21) and O'Pray (1999 (d): 65-76).

⁵⁹ See Greenaway (1986: 13-5).

⁶⁰ See Woods (1996: 72) and Danek and Bayer (2000: 169-70).

⁶¹ See Armstrong (2005: 30-1).

ratios, was his television project *A TV Dante* in 1989,⁶² and it was not until *Prospero's Books* in 1991 that the possible big-screen impact of the technique was realised. As Andrew notes, the film is a conscious 'demonstration of how new technology has expanded film's potential, its superimposed images offering an almost unprecedented complexity of information' (2002 (h): 931). In the opening sequence, for example, Greenaway shows off the full potential of the new computer-based editing technology by superimposing images of text (Prospero literally writing *The Tempest* as it is performed), and details of the twenty-four books in Prospero's library (the books are seen to move, breathe and even bleed with the help of computer animation) over Gielgud's actual performance of the play. Multiple frames within the master frame thus overlap and compete for the viewer's attention. Although, 'to some degree, the relentless proliferation of ideas smothers the dramatic highs and lows [of Shakespeare's play]' (Andrew, 2002 (h): 931), there is no denying 'the sheer ambition and audacity' of Greenaway's conception' (Andrew, 2002 (h): 931).

The Pillow Book, made some four years later and with increasingly sophisticated technology, was 'as visually dense as *Prospero's Books*, with frames within frames, computer graphics, subtitles, projections and superimpositions all vying for the eye in a sumptuous, seamless collage of gold, red and black' (Charity, 2002 (e): 901). Greenaway also constantly alters the aspect ratio of the film, undermining both the notion of an unchanging screen size and the notion that certain aspect ratios - 35mm academy ratio - are suited to realism and other - widescreen - more suited to spectacle.⁶³ The effect is a film that seems to have given itself over entirely to aestheticism, like its protagonist, Nagiko, who single-mindedly searches for

⁶² Co-directed with Tom Philips.

⁶³ Armstrong, for example, argues that the Dogme manifesto stipulated that films must be shot in

the perfect calligrapher, and almost entirely divorced itself from the conventional notions of realism. At one point in the film, when Nagiko has begun an affair with Jerome, a bisexual translator, Greenaway includes a montage of the couple bathing, writing on each other and having sex. The scene is accompanied by the song 'Blonde' by Guesch Patti, the lyrics to which appear at the bottom of the screen. This effect, which recalls a karaoke video, shatters any illusion of reality present in Greenaway's montage and forces the audience to confront the essential artificiality of film and film music.

Realism and Music.

Of all of the technological conventions of cinema, music is perhaps the most potentially problematic in regards to realism. While the overwhelming majority of films feature either an original or compiled score, '[t]here is a school of thought that believes that a sequence will seem more "real" if it is played without music' (Burt, 1994: 213), and entire films, such as Sidney Lumet's *Dog Day Afternoon* (1975), have eschewed a musical score as a means of heightening their sense of reality. However, as Burt notes, 'agreement on the function of music in a film can be a tricky matter [and the] same can be said with respect to its absence' (1994: 215). Even the vast majority of filmmakers who profess to be realists have used music scores in their work without overly compromising its sense of *verisimilitude*. Indeed, it is hard to imagine Leigh's films, particularly *Naked* and *Secrets and Lies*, having the same dramatic impact if they were shown without Andrew Dickson's haunting scores.

Similarly, Loach has maintained the importance of music to enhance the impact of his

academy ratio rather than widescreen, as it is the more realistic (2005: 31). See also Walker (1993: 8).

films yet realises that the use of grand or melodramatic orchestral scores would be at odds with his naturalistic style (see Leigh, 2002: 145-7). Rather, films such as *Riff-Raff* and *Raining Stones*⁶⁴ feature pared-down scores, in both cases by Stuart Copland, which may ironically be less noticeable than no music at all. Other directors working in British art cinema favour different approaches in their films. Davies, for example, uses music in an unusually complex manner. Much of the music featured in *Distant Voices*, *Still Lives*, as I shall demonstrate below, is realistically incorporated into the narrative, being either played on the radio or gramophone or, most commonly, sung by one of the characters. Greenaway, on the other hand, particularly in his collaboration with composer Michael Nyman, uses the music in a manner which demonstrates its artificiality, and, by extension that of the film medium itself.

Greenaway's collaboration with Nyman reversed the traditional method of composing music for a film, where the composer is given a rough cut of the finished film and a cue sheet detailing the times in the film where the director wants musical accompaniment.⁶⁵ Instead, Nyman composes the music first, having seen no more than the screenplay.⁶⁶ This is similar to the technique often employed by Federico Fellini and his long-term composer Nino Rota.⁶⁷ Like Fellini, Greenaway edits, and indeed sometimes shoots the film with the pre-existing score in mind. For example, the sketching sequences in *The Draughtsman's Contract*, which move from one aspect of the estate on which the film is set to the next, do so in time to Nyman's piece 'An Eye for Optical Theory'. Even more pronounced is the opening title sequence of *Prospero's Books*, in which Greenaway intercuts the action with staccato shots of

⁶⁴ See Leigh (2002: 145-6).

⁶⁵ See Marks (1996: 248-59).

⁶⁶ See Greenaway's comments in Ciment (2000: 39) and Russell (1993: 168) and Woods (1996: 203-4).

⁶⁷ See Constanini (1995: 117-19).

flames and water drops at four beat intervals, relating to the beginning of each new bar of the film's opening theme. This gives the sequence an alien quality, as mainstream film editing does not conventionally follow a musical rhythm so closely, and serves to emphasise the constructed, artificial nature of the film and breakdown any *vraisemblance* inherent in the images. Similarly, in the opening shots of *The Cook, The Thief, His Wife and Her Lover*, set in the kitchen of 'La Hollandaise', the restaurant where the bulk of the action unfolds, Greenaway has his characters walk from left to right followed by a tracking camera. However, Greenaway's '[a]rtifice requires that we constantly be aware of music as an element in the film' (Woods, 1996: 203) and both the camera and the characters move in time to Nyman's slow march.⁶⁸ The rhythmical shuffling of the characters is obviously choreographed and resembles a wedding or a funeral march rather than a person's ordinary movement from one place to another. This use of music to help dictate the movement and *mise-en-scène* of his films is yet another example of Greenaway's self-reflexivity, and his wish to highlight the medium's artificial nature.

Music takes on a rare significance in Davies' work, and his autobiographical film *Distant Voices, Still Lives* in particular.⁶⁹ In the film, which portrays the lives of Davies' parents and his three elder siblings in the late 1940s and 1950s, a vast number of popular songs of the time - 'O, Mein Papa', 'Up a Lazy River', 'Worried Man' and 'Barefoot Days' to name but a few - are heard on the soundtrack. However, the vast majority of these are heard diegetically, played in a few instances on the radio or on a gramophone, but mostly sung *a capella* by the characters themselves. Indeed, these

⁶⁸ The piece, 'Memorial', was in fact written by Nyman two years before the film, to commemorate the Hillsborough football disaster.

⁶⁹ As Everett notes, 'any analysis of *Distant Voices, Still Lives* must recognise the role music plays in the creation of its narrative meaning. For example, music is heard for over half the film's total running time, and is never accorded a 'mere' background role but is always foregrounded so as to be at least as

scenes of communal singing are so prevalent that Geoff Andrew dubbed the film 'the first realist musical' (Andrew, 1989: 73). Davies' decision to present the music in his film in this way is 'realistic' for two reasons. Firstly, on a technical level, the playing of a song on the radio or the actual performance of a song, whether it be sung to oneself, such as Davies' mother singing 'If You Were the Only Girl in the World' while hanging out the laundry in *The Long Day Closes*, or communally by a group of people, such as the performance of 'Barefoot Days' in the pub in *Distant Voices, Still Lives*, or even performed with live accompaniment by a band, such as the songs Gena Rowland's jazz singer performs in *The Neon Bible*, adheres to the way we hear music in reality, unlike the music in most films, which seemingly comes from nowhere. Secondly, the frequent use of the radio and the gramophone in the Davies household, as well as the prevalence of the communal sing-a-longs, are a realistic depiction of entertainment for a poor family before the days of affordable television in Britain. Mike Leigh noted that in *Vera Drake*, which is set the same time as *Distant Voices, Still Lives*, the Drake family 'would have had the wireless on all the time, but that would have slowed [the film] down to a naturalistic pace and made the scenes literal' (Lawrenson, 2005: 12), and indeed the radio is rarely heard or mentioned in Leigh's film. Rather, the presence of a wireless next to the family dining-table is enough of a reality effect that stresses the film's setting and the family's class and primary source of entertainment, without having to be heard. In Davies' film however, it is seemingly never turned off (the film begins with a sound-clip from Radio 4's shipping forecast), and when it is, someone is most likely singing. Indeed, one could argue that the songs and sounds that are sung or heard on the radio and the memories that they conjure up in the minds of the protagonists are indeed the subject of the film and that the use of

important as the dialogue, images and narrative action' (2004: 68).

the popular music of the time in *Distant Voices, Still Lives* equates to a kind of aural reality effect that complements the film's visual qualities and creates a complex and complete sense of both period and the notion of memory as reality.

Acting Styles.

One of the key reality effects employed by cinema is the presentation of seemingly authentic characters and dialogue that could believably exist or have existed in the time and milieu depicted in a given film. The emphasis then in realist film is on naturalistic performances. In many anti-realist films, however, the director seeks to subvert notions of filmic reality at the level of performance and favours stylised rather than natural performances from his or her actors.

Loach, for example, tries to add to the realism of his films through the use of non-professional or at least little known professional actors, as they have little or none of the potentially distracting audience recognition factor of a major film actor or Hollywood star. This is in keeping with the work of Eisenstein and the trends of Italian *neo-realism*, both of which favoured casting non-professional actors chosen from the particular milieu and location in which the filmmaker is working, for the authenticity of their looks and behaviour (Bawden, 1976: 706). For example, the principal male cast of *Riff-Raff*, which predominantly centred on life on a construction site, were required to have experience in either the construction or building trades to lend an extra air of authenticity to the film.

However, despite the protestations of those critics and filmmakers who see the casting of non-professionals as a means of achieving a greater sense of reality in a film, the off-screen biography of an actor, whether he be Humphrey Bogart or a

striking coal-miner, is irrelevant and the casting of non-professionals does not in itself constitute a reality effect. The relative 'reality' or authenticity of an actor in a certain role ultimately derives from the quality of their on-screen performance, not from their background or biography. The performances in a film by Mike Leigh are potentially no less authentic and 'realistic' than those in a film by Ken Loach just because the former favours the use of a recurring stock troupe of highly trained professional actors⁷⁰ to play a wide variety of parts, from different regions and social backgrounds, in his films. Indeed, Leigh's approach to casting is diametrically opposed to that of Loach, and he argues that: '[a]s a filmmaker with pretensions to making films about real life how could I possibly achieve this reality with people "off the street"? Only highly sophisticated professional actors could possibly achieve such performances, never amateurs' (Leigh, 1995: 115). Because of this, Leigh and some of his regular actors have come under criticism for creating grotesque caricatures rather than characters, as many of the actors in Leigh's films are well-educated members of the middle-class portraying characters with less education and class privilege. This criticism however, assumes a synonymy between actors and characters that is unwarranted. It might be noted, however, that some attributes such as class or social status have come to be regarded as more readily imitable than others. Whilst it is never remarked upon if a commoner plays a king or queen, the casting of a black person in what is viewed as a 'white' role, or of a white person in a 'black' role, always draws comment and demands explanation. This signals, *inter alia*, the constructedness of *verisimilitude*, the naturalisation of certain categories as imitable and others as not, and the conventions that govern contemporary culture and our perceptions of how 'authenticity' is achieved.

⁷⁰ See Conveney (1997: 1-2).

Despite their different attitudes towards the casting of actors, both Loach and Leigh aim to present authentic and believable characters in their films that are recognisable from the real world. In this way they doubly conform to Bordwell's assertion that art films, at least in part, define themselves through realism – in both their use of real locations and their presentations of realistic, 'psychologically complex' (Bordwell, 2002: 95) characters. The work of Jarman and Greenaway, on the other hand, only tenuously fits this criterion for art cinema.⁷¹ Despite occasionally creating characters of some psychological complexity and resemblance to people in everyday life in films such as *Caravaggio*⁷² and *Belly of an Architect*⁷³ respectively, both filmmakers on the whole favour an approach towards character and performance that is in keeping with artistic notions of 'alienation'. At its most basic level, the term, which derives from the theatrical theory and practice of Bertolt Brecht, stresses the distinction between the actor and the character. His *Verfremdungseffekt*, or alienation-effect, involved the use of jolting reminders of the essential artificiality of theatrical performance, designed to make an audience engage with the play in a critical and intellectual, as opposed to emotional, manner.⁷⁴ While Brecht was uncertain if the alienation effect 'was possible to achieve in cinema' (O'Pray, 1996 (a): 163), his form of self-reflexive realism, which marked a distinct move away from naturalism, had a great effect on a number of filmmakers in the late 1960s and 1970s, such as Godard, Jean-Marie Straub, Dusan Makavejev and Lindsay Anderson,⁷⁵ who have in turn influenced Jarman and Greenaway. While neither Jarman nor Greenaway's cinema 'as a whole can be assimilated to a straightforwardly Brechtian

⁷¹ See Willoquet-Maricondi (2001 (a): 32).

⁷² See Wymer (2005: 99-101).

⁷³ See Hacker and Price (1991: 202-6).

⁷⁴ See Walsh (1981); Dyer (1985: 247-9) and McCabe (1985: 216-35).

⁷⁵ See Walsh (1981); Lovell (1997: 237) and Hedling (1998: 62-153).

model' (Elliot and Purdy, 1997: 86), Brecht's influence is still apparent.⁷⁶

O'Pray has argued that the Brechtian elements in Jarman's films have often developed as part of his collaboration with the actress Tilda Swinton, for whom Brechtian acting theory has been 'particularly influential' (O'Pray, 1996 (a): 162). For example, O'Pray sees the final sequence of *The Last of England*, in which Swinton tears her wedding dress, as a Brechtian commentary, which can 'be read as the behaviour of [...] the actress towards the role of the bride' (O'Pray, 1996 (a): 163). Hill, however, finds this reading somewhat problematic, as 'a film such as *The Last of England* appeals primarily to the emotions and senses rather than the critical faculties' (1999: 161). Indeed, the second half of this sequence, where the screen 'bursts into colour as Swinton launches into a frenzied circular dance to the rising volume of jarring electronic sounds' (Hill, 1999: 159) has a definite emotional power and would at first seem to run counter to the aims of Brecht's epic theatre which strove for an intellectual rather than emotional response.

Brecht did 'not rule out emotions in actor or audience' (O'Pray, 1996 (a): 162) however, and 'her 'performace' [...] creates a profound climax to the film's emotional thrust' (O'Pray, 1996 (a): 148). Furthermore, *The Last of England* may ironically be emotionally powerful due to, rather than in spite of, its alienation effects, which go far beyond Swinton's performance. As Hill has noted, the dress-tearing scene derives its considerable power from

its potent mix of cinematic elements: physical movement and expression. use of colour and black and white, grain of image, speeded-up and slowed-down images, disorientating camera movements and angles. quickfire editing.

⁷⁶ See also Hedling (1998: 214).

obtrusive use of sound and music (Hill, 1999: 161),

all of which, in fact, serve as kinds of alienation effects, and help ‘reconcile [...] film [...] with the tradition of Brechtian theatre’ (O’Pray, 1996 (a): 163). For O’Pray, *The Last of England* and Jarman’s other Super-8 features, especially *The Garden*, are ‘more poetic than novelistic’ (O’Pray, 1996 (a): 163), and feature the same ‘“shifting, syncopated, gestic’ rhythm Brecht recommended [in ‘On Rhymeless Verse with Irregular Rhythms’]’ (O’Pray, 1996 (a): 163). Indeed, in a manner that bears comparison to Brecht’s work, which went against the Aristotelian conventions of theatre, *The Last of England* rejects the narrative form and formal characteristics of mainstream cinema, replacing them with a structure that moves ‘in bursts, surges and jolts, leaping from one inspiration to the next’ (Almeradya, 1995: 233) and a technique that seeks to challenge the audience. Jarman wrote that the ‘relentless’ pace of the editing of certain scenes ‘should wind the audience’ (Jarman, 1987: 14). The violent and near constant movement of the Super-8 cameras in the film is indeed disorientating for viewers accustomed to the more controlled movements of conventionally shot 35mm films.

If Jarman has managed on occasion to make films which have combined alienation effects with moments of cathartic power, in Greenaway’s films the potentially cathartic elements are often ‘held in check [...] by the demand that the audience remain detached and reflective rather than identifying with what is represented on screen’ (Elliot and Purdy, 1997: 86). As a result of this, he has often been accused of leaving ‘the audience emotionally distant in relation to the plight of the characters’ (Willoquet-Maricondi, 2001 (a): 17), who are ‘frequently pawns within Greenaway’s intellectual game-playing’ (Hacker and Price, 1991: 195). However,

Willoquet-Maricondi notes that Greenaway's films also rarely leave them 'reactionless' (2001 (a): 17) and argues that the 'kind of reaction that Greenaway has been trying to bring to the cinema is what he calls 'a reaction with a thought process as opposed to an *immediate* emotional reaction'' (Willoquet-Maricondi, 2001 (a): 17). This bears comparison with the intended outcomes of Brecht's *Verfremdungseffekt*, which sought to directly invert the aims of dominant or 'illusionist' theatre,

that has as its most central characteristics: a desire to (psychologically) penetrate individual experience; its primary appeal is to the emotions rather than the intellect, desiring the audience's empathetic involvement with the events presented before them, in the passive manner suggested by Coleridge's 'willing suspension of disbelief' (Walsh, 1981: 11-12).

Rather, for Brecht and Greenaway, '[t]he actor must give up his complete conversion into the stage character. He shows the character, quotes his lines' (Woods, 1996: 169). The audience is therefore no longer required to identify psychologically with the character. In being able to separate himself and his emotions from those of the character, the viewer is free to *think* about the character and the implications of the play. One way of achieving this alienation effect, and the one favoured by Greenaway, is outlined by the characters of 'The Actor' and 'The Dramaturg' in Brecht's *Messingkauf Dialogues*, who argue for the breaking down of the theatrical convention of the 'fourth wall'. As 'The Dramaturg' puts it, '[a]cting with a fourth wall [...] means acting as if there wasn't an audience' (Woods, 1996: 168). The invisible fourth wall separates the actors from the audience and allows the play to be performed as if it were an incident from real life. Brecht favoured a style of acting

that ignored this illusionary barrier between the actors and the audience and rather called attention to the artificial construction of theatrical performance. As Woods notes, this

potentially implies a return both to Shakespearean and pre-Shakespearean conventions (asides, direct addresses to the audience) and to entertainment (the low theatre of comedies and shows 'with the girls showing off their legs to the officers in the boxes'). In *The Baby of Mâcon*, this is precisely the kind of acting produced by the Father, in the scene in which the child's wet-nurse is selected (with the actresses indeed showing off their breasts to the audience) (1996: 169).

The Baby of Mâcon, Greenaway's most controversial film,⁷⁷ is also his most overtly Brechtian work (Elliot and Purdy, 1997: 86). The film is set in a northern Italian town in 1659 and depicts the performance of a morality play set some two centuries earlier in a famine devastated France. The prologue tells of how this infertility of the land has stretched to infect the people - nothing can grow and no children are conceived - until a baby is miraculously born to a woman well past childbearing age. His father, his sister and the church in turn exploit the baby as each seeks to profit from the 'miracle child'. The audience of this play, a mixture of peasants, clergymen, merchants, dignitaries and noblemen,⁷⁸ are as much the focus of

⁷⁷ Greenaway's film, upon its initial showing at the 1993 Cannes Film Festival, caused a controversy comparable to that caused by Antonioni's *L'avventura* at the Festival in 1960. However, while the furore surrounding Antonioni's film was short-lived and it fast became one of the key films in the foundation of modernist European art cinema and an established classic, Greenaway's film remains the subject of much hostility. See Woods (1996: 165-7; 276-8); Walker (1999: 51); Jones (2000: 186-9) and Walker (2004: 170-1).

⁷⁸ The 'biographies' of 100 members of the audience are explored in Greenaway's multimedia project.

Greenaway's camera as the actors in the play they are watching. Taking their cue from the midwives who 'act as a kind of chorus of cheerleaders at a sporting event' (Elliot and Purdy, 1997: 87), they interact with the play, engaging the actors in bawdy, music hall style banter and counting the number of contractions during the birth. However, the most important member of the audience, a seventeen-year-old Cosimo de Medici, is allowed to interact with the play in a far more direct way. As Elliot and Purdy note, '[w]ith the grave curiosity of a child, he interacts with the actors and interrogates the events as though unable to tell what is real; his comments and questions punctuate the dramatic action with a naivety of response that prevents us from settling down into the customary comfort of an audience' (1997: 87).

'Indeed, everything in *The Baby of Mâcon* functions to underscore the illusionary nature of theatrical representation' (Elliot and Purdy, 1997: 87). This is particularly apparent in the infamous scene at the end of the film, in which the character of the 'the sister' (Julia Ormond), who in the miracle play is a virgin, is to be raped by a succession of men. Her assaulters, acting with the blessing of the church, are not actors in the play, but rather 'real-life' members of the palace militia. When the first of these, who is given the task of deflowering 'the sister', enters the curtain-enclosed bedchamber, Greenaway cuts the camera to show the pair merely sitting on the bed. The sister taunts the naive young soldier by pretending to struggle and imitation sounds as if she was being raped; two other soldiers then enter the bedchamber and hold her down, the 'actress' protests, telling them they need not be so violent for the sake of a play. They encourage the young soldier to rape her. When he has finished, he wipes the blood off his penis with surprise, saying, 'God, she really was a virgin'. The actress, who was herself a virgin, is then repeatedly raped until she

is dead, and the very nature of what is real is called into question as the cast and the audience and the ‘reality’ of the play and that of the ‘real world’ become horrifyingly indistinguishable.

For some critics, the success or failure of *The Baby of Mâcon* as a film has hinged on how effective its Brechtian devices have been in distancing the audience from the horrors on display and the rape scene in particular. For Elliot and Purdy these techniques are ultimately successful and even despite ‘the nature of the violence depicted and the negative reviews the film received, *The Baby of Mâcon* does not carry the same weight of horror as did *The Cook [The Thief, His Wife and Her Lover]*’ (1997: 88). Greenaway however, has attributed the negative and horrified responses that critics and audiences had to this sequence, and the film in general, not only to its political incorrectness and taboo subject matter,⁷⁹ but also to the lack of the ‘distancing irony’ which made the politically incorrect sex and violence of the earlier film more acceptable (see Woods, 1996: 276). However, one wonders if Greenaway is referring to a lack of ‘distancing irony’ in the Brechtian sense, which seems unlikely given the self-conscious proliferation of Brechtian techniques in the films, so much as the blackly comic elements which are more apparent in films such as *The Cook, The Thief, His Wife and Her Lover* and *Drowning By Numbers*. Certainly, *The Baby of Mâcon* is in many ways his most serious film, and his most cynical, and there is still little critical consensus between those who find this ‘[a]gnostic version of the nativity [...] repetitive, cold and misanthropic’ (Charity, 2002 (b): 97) even by Greenaway’s standards, and those, such as myself, who see it as a sober and intelligent attack on superstition and religion and a Greenaway’s most complex study of the relationships

⁷⁹ The film has also been accused of blasphemy due to its depiction of a fraudulent virgin birth, sexually active priests and church-sanctioned murder and child exploitation. See Woods (1996: 166-7;

between film and theatre, artifice and reality, which was unfairly maligned.⁸⁰

Greenaway's final coup in the film is to once again shatter the viewer's (already tenuous) sense of what is real in the final shot of the film. This shot pulls back from the entire cast and the audience of the play -living and dead - taking a bow to the camera to reveal a second, larger audience watching the first, who applaud the play before themselves turning to face the camera and bow to the audience watching the film. Like the final pull back in Andrei Tarkovsky's *Solaris* (1973), this shot challenges the audience to rethink the 'reality' of everything they have just seen. The second audience, who are watching the first, shatters the illusion that the real seventeenth century world had intervened and effected the fictional fifteenth century world of the play. Rather, one is faced with another audience, from an unspecified time, which has watched a play about a play, which is perhaps called *The Baby of Mâcon*, and in many ways mirrors the film one has just seen. However, the second audience's turning and bowing to the camera again undermines the idea of what is real and we are shown that the 'reality' of what we have just seen is merely a cinematic construct: a play within a play within a film.

This self-reflexivity that 'lays bare the devices' at work, while perhaps most prevalent in *The Baby of Mâcon*, is apparent in all of Greenaway's films. For example, in *The Tulse Luper Suitcases: The Story of Moab*, fictionalised 'casting sessions' are interspersed in the narrative as each new character is introduced. The audience thus sees a variety of different actors 'reading' the same part, which serves to impede the viewer from identifying any one face, voice or personality with the character, and alienates the audience from any sense of psychological empathy.

276-281); Ciment (2000: 154-64) and Hotchkiss (2001: 223-254).

⁸⁰ See Woods (1996: 165-8) and Ciment (2000).

Equally, in *Prospero's Books*, Greenaway has Prospero (John Gielgud) read all of the parts, while the other actors remain silent and often motionless until the last act, when Prospero releases them from his spell. This constitutes a rather extreme case of the use of the alienation effect on Greenaway's part, as the audience not only finds it almost impossible to make an empathetic connection with the other, voiceless characters, he also, 'by having Prospero 'invent' the other characters and their lines [...] equates him with the Bard, lending the play a modernist dimension as an exploration of creative processes' (Andrew, 2002 (h): 931). However, further parallels are drawn between Prospero and both Greenaway, as the *auteur* of the film, and Gielgud himself, for whom the film 'serves [...] as an acknowledgment of the imminent end of [his] career' (Andrew, 2002 (h): 931). In Shakespeare, Greenaway and Gielgud's hands then, Prospero is at once writer, director and actor. Prospero therefore becomes more than just a 'character', he becomes a symbol of and commentary on the creative process itself.

Greenaway's decision to alienate his viewers from the characters in his films stems largely from his preference for an 'intellectual art cinema' which emphasises the first two words and favours intellectual content and provocation over emotion and identification, and aesthetic concerns and formal qualities over narrative, performance and what he calls 'psychodrama'.⁸¹ This stresses the fundamental difference between his work and that of not just Loach and Leigh, but also Davies and Jarman, all of who seek to make their films emotionally engaging for their audience. However, Greenaway has at times made concessions to an audience's need to engage emotionally with recognisable and rounded human characters. This is particularly evident in Greenaway's third feature film, *The Belly of an Architect* (1987). The film.

which is frequently cited as Greenaway's 'most convention [and] humane' (Hacker and Price, 1991: 202) work, is in many ways a pivotal one in his oeuvre. The film was not only his most emotionally satisfying work, it also marked Greenaway's first collaboration with a Hollywood actor, Brian Dennehy, who plays the fictional American architect, Stourley Kracklite, who travels to Rome to curate an exhibition on the work of the real-life eighteenth-century architect, Etienne Louis Boullée. Furthermore, the power of Dennehy's acclaimed central performance, 'which threatens to tear the film's formal symmetries to vividly memorable shreds' (Andrew (a), 2002: 90), 'changed Greenaway's attitude towards his actors [and his] subsequent films have all demanded powerful central performances' (Hacker and Price, 2003).

The Belly of an Architect also featured Greenaway's most conventional narrative. If Greenaway has always liked to think of his films existing in a space 'somewhere between Resnais and Hollis Frampton' (Williquet-Maricondi, 2002: 15) in their synthesis of the conventions of modernist European art cinema of the 1960s with the avant-garde concerns of structural film, *The Belly of an Architect* falls decidedly on the side of Resnais and the classical art cinema he represents. Indeed, as Michael Ostwald has noted, the film lacks one of the formal devices or 'organising principles' that Greenaway commonly uses to structure his narratives (see Ostwald, 2001: 137-58). These 'organising principles', in the tradition of Frampton's structural films, are often derived from alphabetical or numerical systems. For example, *A Zed and Two Noughts* was divided into 26 sections by Greenaway, each represented by a letter of the alphabet. Similarly, the narrative of *Drowning by Numbers* is augmented by a count from 1 to 100, at which point, the film ends.

Despite the seeming lack of this avant-garde structuring element, *The Belly of*

⁸¹ See Smith (2000: 100).

an Architect is not such an anomaly in Greenaway's oeuvre however, and his structuring devices often hide the fact that most of his films actually feature a classical, straightforward and often very simple narrative. Indeed, while Greenaway has said that he would 'aim for a cinema which tries to be non-narrative' he has accepted its inevitability, noting that 'a filmmaker is obliged to believe in narration if he pursues cinema' (Chua, 2000: 179). The next Chapter will address in more detail the attitudes of British art film directors towards film narrative. It will examine not only Greenaway's rather ambiguous relationship with narrative and notions of storytelling, but also the narrative approaches of other British directors, such as Loach and Leigh, which have in many ways conformed to the narrative model of classical art cinema and the work of Terence Davies, whose investigations into the nature of memory has perhaps led to the most radical innovations with narrative form in British art cinema.

Chapter Three: Narrative in British Art Cinema.

The introduction to this thesis described art cinema as setting itself explicitly against the dominant narrative model of Hollywood filmmaking, where the majority of cinematic techniques employed by filmmakers ultimately serve the development of a logical, coherent and linear plot.¹ Although art films seek to subvert these elements of logic, coherence and chronology, it is perhaps impossible to rid a film entirely of the most basic conventions of narrative, and few in art cinema have tried.² Art cinema must therefore be viewed as a narrative school of filmmaking, albeit one where the story may be less identifiable and tangible than is normally the case in classical narrative cinema.³

The narratives of many British art films during this period conformed to the narrative model of art cinema set out by Bordwell, with its loosening of narrative causation, episodic plots, narrative gaps, ambiguities and unresolved endings.⁴ However, individual directors often had their own unique attitude and approach to narrative in their work, drawn from a wide variety of sources. This chapter shall thus examine the narratives in the work of several key filmmakers in contemporary British art cinema - Ken Loach, Mike Leigh, Peter Greenaway and Terence Davies - to demonstrate the diverse and sometimes innovative ways in which contemporary British art filmmakers have at once conformed to and subverted the demands of narrative filmmaking.

While the meaning of the term narrative and the specific place of narrative in

¹ See Fowler (2002: 5-6); Bordwell (2002: 95) and Neale (2002: 103).

² See, for example, Bersani and Dutoit (1999: 49-50).

³ See Bordwell (2002: 94-6) and Neale (2002: 104).

⁴ See Siska (1980); Hedling (1997: 178) and Bordwell (2002: 95-9).

cinema are too complex to include in this thesis and have been extensively examined elsewhere⁵ it is first still necessary to outline, briefly, some of the issues inherent in discussing narrative in art cinema. As I have noted, art films cannot be easily identified by particular textual characteristics and there is ultimately no specific narrative form a film must take for it to be considered an art film.⁶ As the introduction established, the modernist film narrative, for example, has been a key feature in many European and British art films since the late 1950s, but it is not an essential one.⁷ A film such as Ermanno Olmi's *The Tree of Wooden Clogs* (1978), for instance, certainly qualifies as an art film,⁸ yet its narrative, centred around life in a turn-of-the-century Italian peasant village, has more in common with the nineteenth-century naturalism of Emile Zola than any modernist writer. At first it may seem difficult to reconcile this seeming contradiction. However, as this chapter aims to demonstrate, the narratives of apparently disparate art films by Davies on one hand and Loach on the other, while superficially very different, are similar in their rejection of 'the textual features of Hollywood films' (Neale, 2002: 104).

Loach, for example, tends to favour simple, straightforward and usually linear narratives in his films. Even on the rare occasions that he has employed a flashback structure, most notably in *Land and Freedom* (1995), the effect could not be further removed from the complex time elisions of *Distant Voices, Still Lives*. Although

⁵ For examinations of narrative in literary studies see, for example, Wayne C. Booth's *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (1961: 149-64); Roland Barthes' 'Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives' (1977: 79-117); Gérard Genette's *Narrative Discourse* (1980); Gerald Prince's *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative* (1982); Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (1983) and Mieke Bal's *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (1985). For examinations of narrative and film see, for example, Rudolph Arnheim's *Film As Art* (1957: 24-9), Bordwell's *Narration in the Fiction Film* (1985); Edward Branigan's *Point of View in the Cinema: A Theory of Narration and Subjectivity in Classical Film* (1984) and *Narrative Comprehension and Film* (1992: 33-44); Sarah Kozloff's *Invisible Storytellers: Voice-over Narration in American Fiction Film* (1988) and Celestino Deleyto's 'Focalisation in Film Narrative' (Onega and Landa eds., 1996: 217-33).

⁶ See Neale (2002: 103-4).

⁷ See Siska (1980) and Neale (2002: 103-5).

Loach has stated that he and screenwriter Jim Allen, 'didn't want to tell the story with a straight A-B narrative, but in a fragmented way' (Fuller, 1998: 102), the shifts in time between Civil War era Spain and present day Liverpool in *Land and Freedom* are clearly delineated and easily followed and the flashbacks themselves are arranged into a progressive, linear narrative. By the standards of mainstream filmmaking however, the narrative of Loach's film is indeed fragmented. This becomes particularly apparent when one views the film in the context of the genre to which it tenuously belongs, the war movie.

Compared with Steven Spielberg's *Saving Private Ryan* (1998), a mainstream war movie that similarly uses present-day sequences as a bracketing device; Loach's film is conspicuously short on action and narrative direction. The title of Spielberg's film even implies a goal on the part of its platoon of central characters. Their 'mission' is to find the Private Ryan of the title and bring him back to safety, an order that sets the characters along a linear path until their goal is reached and the narrative resolved. The narrative of *Land and Freedom*, on the other hand, is prone to digression, such as the long debate about land reform at the film's centre,⁹ and is ultimately more concerned with the increasing political disillusionment and psychological conflicts of its central character, David (Ian Hart), than it actually is with depicting the war itself. For example, in the second half of the film, David is wounded when an old rifle backfires on him and he is sent to Barcelona to recuperate. This section of the film is devoted to David's conflict between his loyalties to the anti-Stalinist P.O.U.M, with whom he fought, and his status as a member of the Communist Party. After he informs his lover, Blanca, of his decision to leave the

⁸ Olmi's film won the *Palm d'Or* at the 1978 Cannes Film Festival.

⁹ See Fuller (1998: 102-3).

P.O.U.M and join the Communist-led international brigade, the two argue over political ideologies as Blanca tries to warn him of Stalin's policy towards the P.O.U.M and the increasingly totalitarian tactics of the Communist Party, who have begun using torture chambers.¹⁰ Blanca then leaves and David remains in Barcelona where in fighting amongst the left and proof of Blanca's comments about the Communist Party cause David to burn his party card and return to her and the P.O.U.M. In this respect *Land and Freedom* conforms to Neale's view that art film narratives tend to be marked by 'a suppression of action in the Hollywood sense, by a consequent stress on character rather than plot and by an interiorisation of dramatic conflict' (Neale: 2002: 104).

Land and Freedom is in many ways typical of Loach's work in the 1990s, when, after almost a decade concentrating on politically motivated documentaries, the bulk of which fell victim to political censorship,¹¹ he emerged as a 'newly inspired storyteller' (Fuller, 1998: 78). As Leigh notes, Loach 'realises that, after the problems getting his documentaries shown [...] he needs to adapt to a newly market-orientated British cinema or he will not be making films at all' (Leigh, 2002: 169). Therefore, in the 1990s, he honed his feature-filmmaking style, for practical as well as artistic reasons, and returned to working closely with writers and began to combine, in subtle ways, 'his previously developed realist techniques [...] with traditional genre and narrative conventions' (Leigh, 2002: 169).

It has however, been argued that these elements are somewhat at odds with one another and that 'Loach's naturalistic style has often disguised melodramatic plotting' (Lawrence, 2006: 45). This is particularly evident in the final Nicaraguan

¹⁰ See Leigh (2002: 167-8).

¹¹ See Fuller (1998: 63-77).

portion of *Carla's Song*, where the screenwriter's¹² belated attempt 'to graft some suspense on to the proceedings' (Charity, 2002 (d): 178) clashes unfavourably with the more observational and character-driven first half, set in Glasgow. Indeed, the majority of critics have argued that 'the Glasgow scenes were best' (Fuller, 1998: 80) and that the film 'lost narrative momentum once it left [...] for Managua' (Fuller, 1998: 107).¹³ Loach is certainly at his strongest when handling this more observational material, which seeks to record authentic and believable scenes from real life, linked together in an episodic fashion with the bare minimum of conventional plot or narrative impetus. In this way, Loach's strongest work largely remains faithful to the ambitions of Italian *neo-realism*.¹⁴ Perhaps the best example of this can be found in *Raining Stones*. The story of an unemployed man struggling to find the money to pay for his daughter's first communion dress, and its telling, owe much to De Sica's *Bicycle Thieves*. The examination of the terrible effects unemployment can have on otherwise hardworking men remains intact. The narrative also retains the 'episodic linearity and alternation between comedy and melodrama' (Leigh, 2002: 143) of De Sica's film, as Bob, the hapless protagonist, moves from one odd job or ill-fated money-making scheme to another, just as Antonio and his son follow one bad lead after another in search of the stolen bicycle. There are also digressions atypical of mainstream cinema. Like Antonio and his son stopping to eat a meal or their visit to a fortune teller, Bob is often seen in a pub, where what little money he has managed to make is squandered rather than making it home to support

¹² In this case, Paul Laverty, who has become Loach's most significant collaborator of the last decade, writing the original screenplays for *Carla's Song*, *My Name is Joe* (1997), *Bread and Roses* (2000), *Sweet Sixteen* (2002), *Aye Fond Kiss* (2004) Loach's segment of *Tracks* (2005) and, most recently, *The Wind that Shakes the Barley* (2006).

¹³ See, for example, Fuller (1998: 107-9) and Charity (2002 (d): 178).

¹⁴ Pasolini, for example, having seen Loach's *Poor Cow* noted that '[e]ven a child a could see that it is a product of Italian neo-realism which has moved into a different context' (Hacker and Price, 1991: 274).

his family or pay for the coveted dress.

It is these digressions that finally differentiate both Antonio and Bob, who unusually for art film protagonists, have very clear-cut goals - finding the bicycle and buying the dress respectively - from the Hollywood-style hero. As Bordwell notes, the 'Hollywood protagonist speeds directly towards the target [but] lacking a goal, the art-film character slides passively from one situation to another [...] Hence a certain drifting episodic quality to the art film's narrative' (1999: 718). What is more, the obsessive nature with which Antonio and Bob pursue their respective goals reveals a concern with individual psychology that is also somewhat typical of the art film protagonist, who, to avoid falling into the mire of angst, alienation and despair that shrouds them, often invent goals for themselves. Indeed, 'had the characters a goal, life would no longer seem so meaningless' (Bordwell, 2002: 96). In this respect Bob's compulsion with buying his daughter's communion dress is not far removed from the obsession David Hemmings' character, Thomas, builds around solving the 'murder' he may have photographed in *Blow-Up*. Both goals are designed to fill a void in the character's lives: in Bob's case, the lack of a job, in Thomas' case, his disillusionment with life and the modern world.

Loach's film differs from *Bicycle Thieves* in one crucial respect however. In the second half of the film, it is revealed that Bob has turned to a volatile loan shark for the money. When he fails to make the payments, his family is threatened. This shifts the narrative of the film from an episodic examination of one man's struggles with unemployment into something approaching a thriller. As Leigh notes, the first hour of the film roughly covers the six weeks leading up to the communion, but after that 'the film moves into its 'urban *verisimo*': 30 minutes of screen time [which]

See also Fuller (1998: 38) and Bazin (2002:58-63).

depicts the 24 hours before the communion' (2002: 144). Although Loach was generally careful to avoid both melodrama and sensationalism, even as Bob, frustrated and furious, attacks and accidentally kills the loan shark, this final section, according to Alexander Walker, 'was epic in feeling, if not size' (2004: 174). Bob later confesses his crime to his priest, who, to Bob's surprise, tells him to tell no one else and burns the loan shark's black book, full of the names of those who owe him. Superficially, the film ends on a positive note, with Bob absolved of his crime, he and many others released from of their debts and his daughter wearing the dress they had both dreamed of at her first communion. If this ending seems both optimistic and neatly resolved in comparison to the ending of *Bicycle Thieves*, there remains something rather uneasy about the *Raining Stones*' dénouement. The anxiety and guilt on Bob's face is palpable as Police sirens are heard in the background and speed past the church and his crime, even 'with the parish priest's apparent blessing [...] falls on the humble hero like the divine curses afflicting mortals in Greek theatre' (Walker, 2004: 174). Bob may have escaped, perhaps only temporarily, being legally punished for his crime, however, his devout Catholicism, that same thing that drove him in his obsessive quest to buy the communion dress, may not allow him to live with the guilt of taking another man's life. Bob's fate at the close of the film is far from sealed then, and *Raining Stones*, like *Bicycle Thieves*, conforms to common critical notion that art films 'almost always produce what Hollywood would call [...] an unhappy - or at least highly ambiguous - ending' (Mast, 1985: 280).

Despite their sometime uneasy combination of fractured, episodic art film narratives and more generic, mainstream elements, Loach's films remain firmly tied to 'the art film's thematic of *la condition humaine*' (Bordwell, 2002: 96), a quality they share with the work of Mike Leigh. Another committed realist, Leigh also tends to

favour a linear progression to his plots¹⁵ and, like Loach, has developed a reputation for using a good deal of improvisation in his work. This, however, is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of his unique working methods.¹⁶ Leigh begins each of his films with a two-or three-page plot outline in place of a completed script (a technique that has not always endeared him to cautious studio executives), and then with the help of a consistent stock of highly professional actors, begins to build characters, dialogue and plot details through a long and (unfilmed) series of improvisations and rehearsals. The end result of this rehearsal period is a detailed shooting script and the dialogue is almost never altered once filming begins (Movshovitz, 2000: 52-3). Indeed, were one to listen to the rapid verbal exchanges and rants in Leigh's *Naked* (1993), one would quickly realise that such complex dialogue could not be improvised during filming and that a great deal of care has gone into the writing of each line. Leigh himself has done much to dispel these misunderstandings about his working method,¹⁷ and over time has changed his own credit in the opening titles from the more egalitarian 'Devised and Directed by Mike Leigh' of earlier films such as *Bleak Moments* (1971) and *Grown-Ups* (1980) to the bolder and more authorial 'Written and Directed by Mike Leigh' of later films such as *Naked* and *Secrets and Lies*.

Leigh's films seem to be both 'written' and carefully structured, and the development of his narratives often betray his roots as a playwright and theatre director. As his biographer, Michael Coveney, notes: '[m]ost of Leigh's best films and plays have a classical structure and a powerful, cathartic climax from which the action slowly, often plaintively, subsides to a conclusion' (Coveney, 1997: 29). The

¹⁵ Indeed, his only film to employ flashbacks in a significant way, *Career Girls*, was also his most disappointing. See Charity (2002 (c): 177).

vast majority of his films being domestic dramas, these climaxes often take the form of family arguments, and the argumentative climaxes of *Meantime* (1983) and *Grown-Ups*, and *Secrets and Lies*, as well as the scene of Laurence's fatal heart attack in *Abigail's Party* (1977), Keith Pratt's escalation to violence in the name of civic virtue in *Nuts in May* (1975), and Johnny's meeting with his diabolical alter ego in *Naked*, do all indeed have a cathartic power.

Naked, with its 'picaresque, open-ended narrative [...] dominated by [...] verbal invention and alienated sexuality' (Ellickson and Porton, 2000: 61) is often viewed as something of a departure for Leigh, and his first proper foray, in terms of themes and narrative, into the realms of art cinema.¹⁸ Indeed, even a brief examination of the film will show it to have many of the key ingredients of an art film as outlined by Bordwell, et al. Firstly, in the character of Johnny, Leigh and David Thewlis have created a quintessential art film hero, a pressure cooker of angst, alienation, disillusionment and sexual rage with a head full of philosophy and apocalyptic theories, who is 'so dispossessed as to become a wanderer and a ranter' (Movshovitz, 2000: 52). Furthermore, by centring the film on his psychological conflicts rather than a conventional story, the film also achieves a classic art film structure. The bulk of the film depicts Johnny's two day odyssey around London, in which he wanders in a seemingly aimless fashion, encountering numerous characters along the way, who more often than not, do not reappear. Some of these characters, such the semi-literate Archie, a Scottish runaway, clearly cannot communicate with Johnny, and like several other characters in the film, threatens him with physical violence. Brian, the night watchman, however, has a philosophical debate with

¹⁶ See Coveney (1997: 8-9) and Clements (1983: 22-58).

¹⁷ See Turan (2000: 92-4).

Johnny before the latter expounds his theory about the existence of God and the apocalypse in a monologue of ‘breathtaking, if crazed, eloquence’ (Ellickson and Porton, 2000: 61). Other characters he encounters are women, who he charms and disgusts and who in turn charm and disgust him. As Ellickson and Porton have noted, the controversial depictions of sex in *Naked* are ‘the complete antithesis of Hollywood soft-focus coupling [and] any idea of ‘sexual union’ is alien to *Naked*’s protagonists, since the character’s frantic writhings ultimately accentuate their essential loneliness’ (Ellickson and Porton, 2000: 61).

In a manner similar to those characters whose lives Johnny briefly drifts into, the central characters of the film - Johnny, Louise, Sophie and Jeremy - who all converge in the girls’ house for the film’s cathartic climax, finally go their separate ways. Jeremy, after terrorising the girls, practically raping Sophie, and belittling the beaten and traumatised Johnny, drives off, most likely to terrorise someone else. Sophie, spurned by Johnny’s rejection of her, packs her things and leaves the house, knowing that she is only going ‘away from here’. Louise, who seems to have rekindled her relationship with Johnny and plans to return to Manchester with him, is last seen in the film leaving for work to hand in her notice. However, when she is gone, Johnny steals the money left by Jeremy, ‘for services rendered’, collects his things and leaves. The final shot of *Naked* is amongst the most haunting in British cinema, as Johnny limps towards the camera we realise he too has gone off to terrorise someone else in his own way, but we do not know who, just as Johnny does not. Finally, there is a sense in the film, highlighted by Johnny’s reading James Gleick’s *Chaos*, of the seeming randomness of life, in which people’s paths intersect with those of others for just a brief moment.

¹⁸ See Medhurst (1993: 7-11).

While *Naked* was indeed something of a turning point for Leigh, and the film's focus on alienation, which was more explicit than in previous films, did perhaps bring his work closer to art cinema than it had previously been, it would be incorrect to state that *Naked* was Leigh's first film to feature an episodic, open-ended narrative typical of European art cinema. On the contrary, for all the revelations the climaxes of his films often bring out into the open, such as the 'truth telling and blood letting' (French, 1995: 13) at Roxanne's birthday party at the end of *Secrets and Lies*, in which Cynthia reveals that Hortense is her daughter and Maurice explains why he and Monica are unable to have children, Leigh's films almost without exception feature open, ambiguous endings and unresolved plot strands. For example, in the final act of *All or Nothing*, Rory, the obese son of the protagonists, suffers a heart attack and is rushed to hospital. The trauma and ensuing grief brings his estranged parents back together after one long dark night of the soul, resolving this conflict in the film. However, what many critics and viewers fail to notice is that several other narrative strands, such as that involving Rory's sister and her work at a rest home, or those involving the family's friends and neighbours in their tenement, are left hanging and unresolved.

Bordwell has argued that 'the slogan of the art cinema might be, "When in doubt, read for maximum ambiguity"' (2002: 99) and the narratives, and especially the resolutions of Leigh's films quietly bear him out. A much more explicit sense of narrative ambiguity can however, be found in the work of Terence Davies, whose experiments with the notions of film conventional film narrative are perhaps the most complex in British art cinema. On the surface, the narratives of his *Trilogy*,¹⁹ *Distant Voices*, *Still Lives* and *The Long Day Closes* (1992), are explicitly autobiographical.

¹⁹ A collection of Davies' first three interconnected short films: *Children* (1976), *Madonna and Child* (1980) and *Death and Transfiguration* (1983), compiled into a feature in 1983.

However, accusations of self-indulgence from some critics and filmmakers such as Ken Russell²⁰, are misleading. Firstly, Davies' 'autobiographical' films are as much concerned with dramatising the collective memories of his six siblings and his parents as they are those of the director himself. *Distant Voices, Still Lives* for example, is set some years before Davies' birth and his 'character' does not appear in the film at all. More importantly, Davies' narratives are ultimately less concerned with personal history than they are - like the films of Alain Resnais - with examining the nature of memory and time.

A sense of this concern can be identified by comparing Davies' narratives with those in another notable series of autobiographical British films, Bill Douglas' triptych: *My Childhood* (1972), *My Ain Folk* (1973) and *My Way Home* (1978), which present an unsparing portrait of working-class childhood and adolescence in post-war Scotland.²¹ Although somewhat episodic in structure, Douglas' work operates in the tradition of nineteenth-century realist and naturalist fiction. He structures his films in a linear manner akin to a kind of cinematic *Bildungsroman*, a fact compounded by Douglas' decision to use the same young actor, Stephen Archibald, to play his surrogate in all three films, which were made over an eight-year period, thus enabling Archibald to grow with the role.²² This style could not be further from that of Davies' films, which by his own admission are 'cyclical not linear' (Davies, 1992: xi).

While the narrative structure of the first part of the trilogy, *Children*, employs a reasonably conventional flashback structure, with Tucker, Davies' alter ego and fictitious projection of his future self, remembering scenes from his childhood.

²⁰ Russell has described the filmmaker as the 'self-obsessed Terence Davies', and suggested that he apparently attended film school, but 'presumably not for very long' (Russell, 1993: 168).

²¹ See Dick, Noble and Petrie (1993) and Ellis (1977: 68-70).

²² The *Bildungsroman* structure of the trilogy is further compounded by the grandmother giving Jaime, Douglas' surrogate, a copy of *David Copperfield* on his return home from national service.

Periodically through the film, present tense sequences featuring the now middle-aged Tucker are inserted amongst the childhood scenes so that the viewer is aware that these are memories. However, Tony Williams notes that ‘Davies has gradually moved away from a sixties-influenced documentary style towards an achronological, inner world of [...] personal psychobiography [and] even *Children* exhibited particular non-linear memory traits [...] that would be developed further in his work’ (Williams, 1993: 238). Indeed, over the seven-year making of the *Trilogy*, Davies’ style as a filmmaker evolved considerably, a fact that becomes all the more apparent when the film is watched as a single ninety-minute feature.²³ By the final part, *Death and Transfiguration*, Davies has all but dispensed with the traditional cinematic techniques used to introduce or announce flashback and memory sequences, such as dissolves and fades. Rather, different periods of Tucker’s life, especially his early school days and his slow death in an hospital geriatric ward now ‘rush together in an a-chronological fashion’ (Gibson, 1984: 321). Tucker’s memories also begin to be ‘triggered’, usually by aural fragments from songs and dialogue, which have an evocative resonance for the character. For instance, a crude joke shared by two of the junior nurses (‘What’s pink, wrinkled and hangs out your underpants... Your mother’) shifts abruptly to a sequence depicting his mother’s funeral. Different time frames also begin to co-exist within the same scene. For example, the ward sister’s exclamation ‘Good morning boys’, a line addressed to the old men in the ward, is cross-faded on the soundtrack to a voiceover of Tucker’s primary school headmistress addressing her ‘boys’ in a similar manner. Similarly, the sequences depicting the build up to Christmas in the geriatric ward, the dialogue between the nurses evokes

²³ Since the completion of the final part, *Death and Transfiguration* in 1983, the films are rarely shown as individual shorts.

memories of Christmas Eve mass as a child. However, these memories are again not seen, only heard, in the form of children singing festive hymns and a priest's blessing, and the images on screen remain those of the elderly, dying Tucker.

By the time he made *Distant Voices, Still Lives* in the late 1980s, Davies' distinctive style was fully developed and his handling of narrative increasingly complex. Time becomes here a pliable substance, which Davies moulds and manipulates, flashing forward and backward without indication in a manner prescribed by artistic requirement and 'emotional exactness' (Gibson, 1984: 321) rather than the need for narrative coherence. The time frame of the film's narrative is the early to mid 1950s, around the time of Davies' birth. However, he writes himself (and three of his siblings) out of the film and identifies himself 'with the camera instead of a surrogate figure' (Williams, 1993: 238). The narrative is divided into two sections. *Distant Voices*, which focuses on the misery inflicted on the three eldest Davies children and their mother by the oppressive and tyrannical patriarch, Tommy Davies, and ends with his death, and *Still Lives*, which portrays the subsequent years 'where life has reached an even keel and ticks silently away' (Davies, 1992: 103). Although Davies notes that '[a]ll the family history is packed into *Distant Voices*' (Davies, 1992: 103), he states that the film is explicitly about 'memory and the mosaic of memory' (1992: 103). Davies' repetition of the word 'memory' is particularly telling. The film is unquestionably, on one level, about his family's memories and an attempt to exorcise the demon that is Tommy Davies. Perhaps more importantly though, *Distant Voices, Still Lives* is about the art of filming memory: which, for Davies, lies less in the actual depiction of the remembered events themselves, but rather in the manner in which they are arranged and presented. As Gibson writes, it is as though 'Davies' evocation of the past were somehow qualitatively closer to

memory than anyone else's flashbacks have aspired to be' (Gibson, 1984: 321). As Davies himself notes,

[m]emory does not move in a linear or a chronological way - its pattern is of a circular nature [...] Thus any 'story' involving memory is not a narrative in the conventional sense but of necessity more diffuse, more elliptical. Therefore conventional narrative expectation will not be satisfied in any conventional way (Davies, 1992: 74).

For Davies then the content of the film - memory - dictates the form, and the narrative ellipses and distortions of time and chronology are designed to give an authentic 'sense of what remembering actually feels like' (Kuhn, 2002: 161).

Again, as in the final parts of the *Trilogy*, memories are triggered by sounds, the *Distant Voices* of the title. Indeed, over the opening shot, an exterior of the house in the rain, Davies plays a 1950s archive recording of the BBC radio 'shipping forecast' to introduce his narrative. The words of the radio announcer, which would seem strange, even nonsensical to someone unfamiliar with this very British institution - 'Faroes, Cromarty, Forth, Tyne, Dogger, German Bight, Mallin, Hebrides, Fastnet' etc - become a sort of incantation that summons the past. In the next shot, over which the announcer's voice can still be heard, the mother, Nellie Davies, tells the children to 'get your skates on' from the foot of the stairs. While the mother is visible in the shot, the sounds that follow, of each of the three children coming down the stairs and wishing her a good morning, are overlaid on a shot of the empty staircase. In the ensuing conversation - heard but not seen - Nellie asks Eileen if she is nervous, leading one retrospectively to infer that the scene is depicting the morning

of her wedding, to which the narrative will soon return.

As the last Chapter implied, Davies is perhaps the most radical and original of all modern British filmmakers in his use of music. None of Davies' autobiographical works features a commissioned score as all pieces of music featured in his work, particularly popular songs, are inextricably linked to a certain memory or emotion. However, Davies never uses the songs of the period for the purpose of indulging in empty nostalgia. Rather, his 'impressionist vignettes are explained, deepened, counterpointed and savagely undercut by the popular songs [which] fuel the narrative' (Andrew (c), 2002: 299). In one particularly memorable scene Maisie asks her mother why she married Tommy. The two voices are again presented as unseen voiceovers and the accompanying image is a close-up of Nellie's legs and feet as she sits on the outside of the window ledge to wash the windows and her response - 'He was nice. He was a good dancer' - triggers the playing of Ella Fitzgerald's rendition of 'Taking a Chance on Love' on the soundtrack. As the shot then begins to dissolve the song continues to play, and one could be forgiven for expecting to see a match cut to the same pair of legs dancing with Tommy some years earlier, during a happier time. However, one instead 'remain[s] privy to the truth by memory sequences that reveal the repressed brutality behind supposedly pleasurable moments' (Williams, 1993: 243) and the ensuing scene shows Tommy beating his screaming wife relentlessly in the hallway of their house, with 'Taking a Chance on Love' all the while playing over the image. Similarly, Eddie Calvert's recording of 'O Mein Papa' is played at Tony's wedding reception at the close of the film, and the song has 'never [...] been heard to such ironic and emotionally devastating effect' (Andrew, 2000 (c): 299), as Tony's memories of his father violently intrude on the happy occasion.

In addition to these popular recordings, Davies also has the cast perform

songs. However, the technique could not be further removed in style and effect from that of Dennis Potter,²⁴ who has actors lip sync to recordings to provide an ironic commentary on the action. Rather, Davies' actors sing the songs themselves, *a cappella* - regardless of the quality of their voice - both to themselves, and more commonly, at a social gathering in the house or at the pub. While there is still a certain irony in the choice of songs Davies has his characters sing, there is no irony in the performances. Rather, the songs, which feature far more prominently after Tommy's death, re-enforce both a sense of community and shared memory amongst the characters in the film. For example, Nellie's performance of 'Barefoot Days' in the pub immediately follows the scene of her brutal beating. Her song, shot in a long close-up that shows her constantly smiling, is a moment of quiet triumph, and when she is joined in the chorus by all the other women present, they 'express solidarity in song and mutual support [for one another]' (Williams, 1993: 241). However, Davies again ironically counterpoints the lyrics in the song with his images. The song, which nostalgically talks of an economically poor childhood, continues to be sung by the cast members as the scene shifts to 1940 where Tommy, Nellie and the three young children can be seen chopping wood for kindling and tying it into bundles, then cuts to an exterior shot of the three children pushing a heavy cart full of wood down the street. The implication is that the Davies family are selling the wood for badly needed extra money during the war, and that Tommy sends the children out to find it in rubbish heaps and bombed-out houses. The children are then caught in an air-raid and only find shelter just in time, with the help of an ARP warden. The enraged Tommy hits Eileen when she arrives at the shelter, shouting 'Where the bleedin' hell have you been?', when he knows full well that it was he who sent them out, with a clear

²⁴ See Fuller, (1994).

disregard for their safety. He then forces her to sing 'Roll out the Barrel' and one by one the frightened neighbours in the shelter join in. However, unlike the singing of 'Barefoot Days', there is no joy to be found in this particular instance of communal singing for the Davies family. As Williams notes, '[t]his sequence reveals the buried past pain beneath a seemingly pleasurable present act [...] Scenes often clash with each other, as they are chosen for their depiction of intense emotional [...] situations rather than for any smooth, linear, chronological progression' (Williams, 1993: 243).

While the narrative of *Distant Voices, Still Lives* is, to use Davies' word, a 'mosaic' of memory, perhaps a more fitting way of describing the film's narrative would be to liken it to leafing through a family photo album,²⁵ where each picture tells its own individual story, yet also forms part of a larger narrative of the family's complete history. The film is fascinated by the power and aesthetics of photographs, as the second half of the title, *Still Lives*, implies. Again, content dictates form, and the *mis-en-scène* of the film keeps camera movements to a bare minimum, favouring instead long static shots more akin to a still image than a moving one. The colour palate of the film too mimics the drab sepia tones and brownish hues of photographs of the period.

Photography also inspires several of the film's key images and event. The episodic narrative almost ritualistically focuses on those moments such as weddings, funerals, christenings, and a brief scene of a seaside holiday, when people are likely to take photographs. The first glimpse of Tommy Davies in the film is in a photograph above the mantelpiece. Although in the background, it seems to dominate the *mise-en-scène* of the shot, as his family, dressed all in black are gathered under it. By his conspicuous absence, one infers that this scene depicts the family on the way to his

funeral, and as they file out of the house, the camera tracks past them and fixes on a close-up of the photograph. It is a benign image. Tommy is smiling, leading a horse by the reins. As, at this point in the film, the viewer knows nothing about Tommy Davies except that he has died, one infers from the photograph that he was a happy and decent man. However, the photographs in Davies' film lie, and Tommy is soon revealed to be a sadist and a tyrant, his presence still dominating the lives of his family long after his death, just as his photograph on the wall continues to be a dominant image in the film.

In the next sequence, which shows Nellie and the three children facing the camera, posing for Eileen's pre-wedding photo, the photograph of Tommy is still located in the centre of the shot behind them. Eileen says, 'I wish me Dad was here' and the image of a happy family, who mourn the passing of their husband and father, remains intact. The camera then pans to a close-up of Maisie, whose internal thoughts - 'I don't. He was a bastard and I bleedin' hated him' - are heard in voiceover. Here the twin lies of the happy family and photographic truth are shattered, and Davies' mosaic of memory begins to assemble itself. The action then shifts to a time when Tommy was alive and he forces Maisie to scrub the floor of the rat infested cellar and later beats her repeatedly with a yard brush for no apparent reason, before returning to the posed wedding photograph, where Eileen is seen to repeat her wish for her father to be there.

Although her words are exactly the same, Davies presents it this second time in a two-shot of Eileen and Tony. Unlike before she seems to turn to him as she says it, and he too remembers a particularly violent encounter with his father. Here Davies is distorting both time and the individual perception of events. By returning to a

²⁵ See Everett (2004: 71-80).

variation of the original shot Davies emphasises that both Maisie and Tony experience their traumatic flashbacks simultaneously. By repeating Eileen's line in two subtly different ways he is able to demonstrate the subjective nature of remembering as both her siblings remember the words as being addressed at them. However, Davies is not looking to find the facts of what actually happened, and which of the two, if indeed either, she was addressing is ultimately of no consequence. Rather, for Davies, 'Memory *is* its own validity' (Davies, 1992: 74; his emphasis). He accepts that it is both highly subjective and often unreliable and incomplete. On many other occasions in the film the memory of one family member is contradicted or proved false by that of another.

Davies has claimed that he structures his films around an 'emotional logic' (Falsetto, 1999: 76), rather than any conventional means of shaping a narrative, and his claim is justified in *Distant Voices, Still Lives*. However, the film's companion piece, *The Long Day Closes*, which Davies states is about his own 'loss of childhood paradise and innocence' (Davies, 1992: xi), takes the director's experiments with time and memory to an even greater extreme. This makes the film in many ways his most rewarding, but also most critically problematic work. *The Long Day Closes* defies any conventional attempt at plot summary, and even more than the previous films throws sequences together in an indecipherable order. For example, a scene where Bud is told by the school nurse that he has lice is followed by a scene of him helping to wash his sister's hair, whereas the next scene in a logical narrative progression, in which Bud is de-loused, occurs some twenty minutes later. Falsetto notes that the film is full of similar instances of what is often referred to as 'retroactive match structure', whereby a shot or sequence's significance does not become fully apparent until it is 'matched' by another shot or sequence featured later in the narrative (1999:

79).

The time frame of Davies' narrative, which takes place over the course of only one year (1955-6), when Bud, Davies' surrogate, is aged ten and eleven and on the threshold of secondary school and puberty, only compounds the problem of following the film's chronology. In the *Trilogy* the jumps in time are more easily followed as Tucker is played by four different actors at four different stages of his life: as a young boy, in his early twenties, at middle age and old age. Equally, in *Distant Voices, Still Lives* the ages of Eileen, Maisie and Tony (as children or adults), their marital status and the presence of Tommy Davies, who dies half-way through the chronological narrative, act as means of judging the temporal location of certain scenes. Bud however, does not physically change at all during the film's narrative, and therefore his age or appearance offers no clues as to the sequence of events. And unlike *Distant Voices, Still Lives*, the narrative does not concentrate predominantly on special occasions, and although there are scenes at Christmas, New Year and Bonfire Night, the majority of sequences could be located at almost any specified time.

In the film 'whole periods of time are elided in a few seconds of screen time while other moments, insignificant in themselves, are expanded into whole sequences' (Davies, 1992: xi). For instance, in one scene, set on New Year's Eve, Bud's mother asks, 'I wonder what 1956 will bring?'. In the next three rather brief scenes, the whole of 1956, from January to September, is reduced to a few moments of screen time as Davies answers his mother's question. Bud is shown at his primary school, where the Sisters are kind to him when he has a nose bleed. This is followed by an ominous shot around the schoolyard, which is now empty, and scenes from of his first day at secondary school where his form tutor systematically beats each boy once with a cane and taunts about Bud's sexuality begin. This sequence not only distils the

year's events down to a matter of minutes, but also summarises the keynotes of the film - the end of a happy childhood and the start of a miserable adolescence - yet, because of the speed with which Davies elides through these incidents, they initially seem to be of little significance. However, other scenes, such as Bud waiting outside a cinema in the rain for someone will to take him in to see an 'Adult' rated film, go on for longer than is seemingly necessary. In a more conventional film narrative this single-shot sequence would perhaps act as an establishing shot, leading to a subsequent scene inside the cinema. In Davies' film however, this shot does not establish a subsequent scene, but rather takes on its own significance, highlighting the way in which Bud's most vivid memories are all attached to cinema.

Davies has described *The Long Day Closes* as an examination of 'the enduring power of the imagination (seen through the movies)' (Davies, 1992: xi). Cinema thus takes the place of photography in *Distant Voices, Still Lives* as a means of shaping the narrative, commenting (often ironically) on the action and dictating the form and visual aesthetic of the film. This can be seen from the film's opening shot, which combines intricate camera movements, a complex soundtrack and evocative art direction to establish the location and set the tone of the film.²⁶ The camera begins with a close shot fixed on a grey brick wall as rain pours down. The camera pans down to show a street sign reading 'Kensington Street L5' and a tattered and torn cinema poster for the Hollywood epic *The Robe* plastered on the bricks beside it. These two pieces of information are almost as clear an indication of the time and setting of the film as a caption reading: 'Liverpool, The Mid 1950s' would be.²⁷ The camera then slowly tracks down the near flooded street of derelict terrace houses, and

²⁶ See Davies (1993: 137-8) and Hunt (1999: 8-10).

²⁷ 'L5' is a Liverpool Postal District and *The Robe*, the first film released in Cinemascope, was made in

the 20th Century-Fox logo theme is heard on the soundtrack. This burst of music begins Davies' multi-layered collage of aural film clips that will play over the opening shot, and indeed, throughout the film. It also establishes Davies' frame of filmic reference. Unlike his art cinema contemporaries, such as Jarman and Greenaway, who litter their films with allusions to high art, Davies' work is immersed in popular culture, whether it be the songs in *Distant Voices*, *Still Lives*, or *Hollywood*, and to a lesser extent, British filmmaking of the 1940s and 1950s in *The Long Day Closes*. The soundtrack then becomes more complex as Nat King Cole's rendition of 'Stardust', another song about memory, is heard mingling with the sound of the rain, and there is a cross fade to the sound of a gong and Margaret Rutherford's voice from *The Happiest Days of Your Life* (1950) saying 'A tap, Gossage, I said "tap" - you're not introducing a film'. This is a humorous reference to the iconic gong that introduced each film made by the Rank organisation, which perhaps stands as British cinema's equivalent to the 20th Century Fox theme or the roar of the MGM lion.

As the camera gets halfway down the street it enters one of the derelict houses, where the rain is pouring inside, and where obviously no one has lived for some considerable time. The next aural sound-clip is from Alexander Mackendrick's classic Ealing comedy *The Ladykillers* (1955), and features the voice of Alec Guinness saying, 'Mrs Wilberforce, I understand you have rooms to let'. This line is however relieved of all its comical associations when played against the deserted and now uninhabitable house. The camera slowly continues to track through the hallway and crane up the stairs, and the rain becomes louder before the camera stops, half way up the stairs, and the image dissolves to a shot taken from the same camera position.

1953. However, the age of the poster would imply that the film was set some time after. See Hunt (1999: 8-10).

however, '[t]he house is no longer derelict but bathed in brilliant sunshine [and] Bud, a boy of eleven, sits on the stairs' (Davies, 1992: 137-8) and calls, 'Can I go to the pictures, Mam?'

The sequence on the stairs echoes the opening shot of *Distant Voices, Still Lives*, but with two crucial differences. Firstly, the elaborate and complex camera movements are unlike anything in the previous film, which, in trying to imitate the visual style of still photographs, was predominantly shot in long static takes with the camera locked off on the tripod. Here however, the visuals imitate the Hollywood films beloved by Davies in his youth and therefore the camera is almost constantly moving in long, considered takes that recall the camera work of Douglas Sirk and Vincente Minnelli. Secondly, Bud, unlike his siblings in the previous film, is seen before he speaks. Thus his centrality to the narrative is established. In *Distant Voices, Still Lives* the memories of the three children and Nellie are shown as a single collective memory and each individual's suffering is given equal weight and consideration. Here however, the focus is solely on Bud, and the disembodied voices that introduce the film are his memories from his own lost childhood.

The majority of Bud's memories and fantasies are triggered by his love of cinema. For example, a viewing of *Carousel* (1956) leads to a sequence depicting a family visit to a carnival. During one of the (slightly less numerous) communal sing-a-longs, Bud and his sister Titch perform 'A Couple of Swells' from *Easter Parade* (1948). A memory of his secondary schoolteacher, with his Terry Thomas style moustache, is overlaid with a quotation from *Private's Progress* (1956). Most effective however, is the dénouement of the narrative, where Bud sees his best friend, Albie, go to the movies with another of his classmates. Rather than run after them, Bud goes down to the dark coal cellar, which becomes his own personal *Inferno*. At

this point aural quotations come crashing together as they did at the beginning of the film, and reflect the pain and confusion Bud feels in his mind. A school geography dictation on the various types of erosion and an (earlier) conversation with Albie about what they each received for Christmas combine with Jean Simmons' voice from David Lean's *Great Expectations* saying 'He's just a boy. A common labouring boy', and Martita Hunt's eerily repeating the word 'play', as he contemplates his lost friendship. The film ends with a fade to an earlier time frame where Bud and Albie are seen looking at the night sky and Arthur Sullivan's 'The Long Day Closes', which gave the film its title, plays to the fade out. But true to the style and content of the film, and to Bud's own all-consuming cinephilia, the final word on Bud's feelings of sadness and rejection comes from a film, Orson Welles' *The Magnificent Ambersons* (1943), as Welles' final narration from that film is heard in the dark and empty coal shed:

VOICEOVER: Something had happened. A thing which years ago had been the eagerest hope of many, many good citizens of the town. And now it had come at last: George Amberson Minafer had got his come-uppance. He got it three times filled and running over. But those who had so longed for it were not there to see it, and they never knew it. Those who were still living forgot all about it and all about him.

This quotation does not feature in Davies' published shooting script of the film and one wonders if he only saw the appropriateness of these words for his own film after it had been made. Regardless, it is a particularly poignant way for Davies to end his autobiographical cycle and his examination of time and memory, as it does not speak

of the enduring power of memory, but rather of forgetting.

If the complex narratives and time elisions of Davies' films present a 'highly formalised and self-reflexive exploration of [...] memory' (Caughie and Rockett, 1996: 53) comparable to the work of Alain Resnais, Greenaway's claim that his own 'cinema is somewhere between Resnais and Hollis Frampton' (Willoquet-Maricondi, 2001 (a): 15) suggests an even more radical approach to narrative. However, while the narratives of many of his feature films do betray the influence of Frampton and structural cinema, they rarely exhibit the complex temporal structures and extreme fragmentation of Resnais films such as *Hiroshima, Mon Amour* and Greenaway's favourite, *Last Year in Marienbad*.²⁸ On the contrary, Greenaway's admits his films are in fact 'very classic and simply constructed; first, a prologue, then three acts and an epilogue' (Kilb, 2000: 61), and almost always arranged in a straightforward, linear fashion.²⁹ This perhaps seems ironic for a director who has asserted that '[c]inema is far too rich and capable a medium to merely be left to the storytellers' (Greenaway, 1986: 15). However, I shall demonstrate that Greenaway's relationship with narrative is both complex and slightly contradictory.

Despite the above comment, Greenaway does not object to narrative cinema, and he in fact views narrative as an unavoidable fact of art.³⁰ However, he has frequently decried cinema's dependence upon literature - particularly the nineteenth-century novel³¹ - for its sources, inspirations and storytelling techniques.³² Rather,

²⁸ See Willoquet-Maricondi (2001 (a): 17).

²⁹ In *The Pillow Book*, Greenaway's one film that relies heavily on flashbacks, the childhood scenes are filmed in black and white, 'a traditional narrative device' that makes it clear that these scenes are flashbacks (Petrakis, 2000: 175).

³⁰ See, for example, Turman (2000: 152).

³¹ As Greenaway notes: '[y]ou would hardly think that the cinema had discovered James Joyce sometimes. Most [...] cinema [...] is modeled on Dickens and Balzac and Jane Austen' (Brokes, 2004: 6).

³² Greenaway has commented that he believes 'the cinema we've got after 100 years is in some cases not cinema at all, but a history of illustrated text' (quoted in Petrakis, 2000: 173).

Greenaway, like Jarman, sees cinema as a predominantly visual medium that should consolidate its ties to the imagistic and compositional vocabularies of painting, instead of providing mere illustrations of literary texts. As a result, Greenaway has been reluctant to adapt his films from literary sources,³³ and has only done so on two occasions: *A TV Dante* and *Prospero's Books*, taken from *The Divine Comedy* and *The Tempest* respectively.³⁴ Interestingly, these two films, made between 1989 and 1991, represent his first experiments with the digital and computer technology and multi-screen images that have now become integral to his work and it is possible that he drew on literary sources at this time in order to provide these films with a more cohesive and recognisable narrative - for both himself and his audience - around which he could structure his experiments with new technology.³⁵

Greenaway was perhaps also attracted to adapting these literary classics for their self-reflexive qualities; like Greenaway in his films, Dante and Shakespeare constantly make intertextual allusions to their own work and that of other writers, as well as to the act of writing itself. For example, Dante, as Hacker and Price note, was, 'an ideal source for Greenaway, in that his work shows complex and rigorous structure, and numerous metaphors, images and word-plays to work from' (1991: 206-7), and despite the sometimes surreal juxtaposition of Dante's words with contemporary images and the superimposition of visual footnotes - in which Dante scholars, naturalists such as David Attenborough and artist such as Tom Philips

³³ See Chua (2000: 177).

³⁴ With the exception of these two films Greenaway's works have all been based on his own original screenplays. His scripts often however, feature less traditional forms of adaptation taken from non-literary sources. Some, for example, derive their plots from older films. *The Draughtsman's Contract*, for instance can be read as a period version of Antonioni's *Blow-Up* mingled with elements of Resnais' *Last Year at Marienbad*, the plot of *The Pillow Book* is a variation of that of Kon Ichikawa's *An Actor's Revenge* (1965) and *8½ Women* (1999) is an extended extrapolation of the harem fantasy sequence of Fellini's *8½*.

³⁵ See Elliot and Purdy (1997: 88-90).

comment on obscurer parts of the text from small screens within the screen (Hacker and Price, 1991: 207) - his adaptation remains very faithful to the original text.

Prospero's Books is in many ways similarly faithful, however, by adding a dimension and 'structuring [the film's] motifs around the 24 books Prospero took into exile³⁶ [...] the director conveys the arcane knowledge the Duke needs to take his magical revenge' (Andrew (h), 2002: 931).

It is ultimately very telling that Greenaway's adaptation should be called *Prospero's Books* rather than *The Tempest*. On one level it stresses the originality of Greenaway's vision, which 'could hardly differ more from literal adaptations like Branagh's *Henry V*' (Andrew, 2002 (h): 931). On another however, it points to the fact that Greenaway's films, for all his comments on cinema's over-dependence on literary sources and forms, are themselves 'excessively *literary*' (Field, 1981: 50, his italics). Indeed, while his films do reject the narrative form of the nineteenth century novel, they find their 'equivalents in the literary practices of [Jorge Luis] Borges and [Italo] Calvino' (Field, 1981: 50) and an examination of Greenaway's *oeuvre* bears this out.³⁷ For example, *Prospero's Books* shares with Borges a fascination 'with the creation of fictional works, of critical oeuvre - books, documents, objects - and their respective authors - created within the meticulous and limpid style of the critical essay or short literary note' (Field, 1981: 50). The contents of the books are meticulously examined in the film; each is illustrated visually, with an accompanying voiceover (by Gielgud), which often provides biographical details of the 'authors' and explains their strange and sometimes morbid and cabalistic motivation in writing them. This, in truly Borgesian fashion, presents a great number of writers, books and

³⁶ As imagined by Greenaway, the eponymous books dealt with water, anatomy, cosmology, pornography, mirrors, architecture, ruins, hell, music, etc.

encyclopaedia entries which have never existed as if they did, 'and thus necessarily re-arranges the history of literature' (Field, 1981: 50). Furthermore, the short 'narrative' of each of the twenty-four books in the film also recalls Calvino's *The Castle of Crossed Destinies*, which generated 'an infinitude of narratives and acts of storytelling from the re-shuffled images of the tarot pack' (Field, 1981: 50). Similar deployments of this technique can in fact be found in all Greenaway's work which is 'consciously full of 'little narratives [and] people telling stories to one another' (Siegel, 2000: 81). This is evident in *The Falls*, with its 'narrative' of ninety-two short stories, each one the biography of a survivor of a 'Violent Unknown Event', the dinner conversations of *The Draughtsman's Contract*, Venus de Milo's pornographic stories in *A Zed and Two Noughts*, the doctor telling Kracklite anecdotes about the deaths of Roman emperors in *The Belly of an Architect*. Furthermore, in *The Audience of Mâcon* (1993), a photo exhibition featuring one hundred of the audience members in *The Baby of Mâcon*, each portrait was accompanied by a brief, Borgesian 'back-story' (of forty words or less), thus forming a myriad of miniature narratives that grew out of the original concept of the film.³⁸

Greenaway, has also frequently used simple devices, such as 'games, lists, alphabets, countings' (Woods, 1996: 22) - which he refers to as "'organising principles' [...] a thematic sequence that manifests itself repeatedly throughout the film' (Ostwald, 2001: 138) - to structure his films, and like his examinations of Prospero's eponymous books, these 'forms of classifications all logically drawn from the film's theme or setting' (Hacker and Price, 1991: 190).³⁹ *The Draughtsman's*

³⁷ Greenaway has said that he sees himself as 'contemporary with the South American writers and also Calvino, Kundera, etc' (Klib, 2000: 61).

³⁸ See Greenaway (1993 (c)) and Woods (1996: 50-5).

³⁹ As Ostwald notes these formal devices are 'a means by which an audience or critic may start to unravel the complex weave of language, image, and meaning present in the films [...] like a critical

Contract, for example, is divided into twelve parts, one for each of the elevations the draughtsman is commissioned to draw. *A Zed and Two Noughts* is divided into eight parts, each representing one of the stages of Darwinian evolution. *The Pillow Book* is organised around the thirteen 'books' of poetry the protagonist writes and the lists of 'Elegant Things' she derives from the writings of Sei Shonagon. In this way, as Alan Woods notes, Greenaway's cinema offers, 'in place of the norm of genre narrative, the 'natural' systems to get us from opening to final credits, a variety of skeletal structures, narratives only in the sense that 'anything that moves through time necessarily has some sort of narrative' (1996: 23).

The 'clearest [and] most intellectually ruthless' (Woods, 1996: 23) of Greenaway's number-counts comes however, in *The Baby of Mâcon*. Overall, the film has one of Greenaway's most simplistic structures - a prologue, three acts, an epilogue, (and two intermissions)⁴⁰ - which correspond directly to those of the miracle play performed within the film. However, in the infamous rape scene at the end of the film, Greenaway plays a number game worthy of one of the complex mathematical patterns or elaborate numerological lists of the Marquis de Sade's *120 Days of Sodom*.⁴¹ In the scene, the daughter (Julia Ormond), who is sentenced to death for the murder of the Bishop's son (Ralph Fiennes), cannot be executed because she is a virgin. A solution is offered whereby the soldiers of the local militia will deflower her. However, despite the fact a 'virgin can only be deflowered once, and one rape would be enough to allow the daughter to be hanged [...] she is raped two hundred and eight times' (1996: 166). This number is not arrived at arbitrarily, but

clue in a detective story: without it the narrative seems curiously empty, while with it, the scene, however complex, is made accessible' (Ostwald, 2001: 138).

⁴⁰ The film was originally conceived as an opera and Greenaway notes that the film's structure mirrors that of 'grand operas of the nineteenth century' (Ciment, 2000: 157).

⁴¹ See Woods (1996: 166; 280-1).

rather through what Woods calls ‘a strange quiz game’ (1996: 166).

The bishop asks, how many times did Caligula’s sister serve the Roman senators? How many times did Diocletian abuse the daughters of Maxentius? How many times did the Christian virgins suffer the abuses of the Macabees? He is answered [...] thirteen times; thirteen plus thirteen times; thirteen times thirteen times (Woods, 1996: 166).

Greenaway does not film the rape directly, but rather devises a virtuoso nine-minute take in which the rape is presented in the background in ‘shadow theatre figures’.⁴² The foreground is dominated by Cosimo and his entourage, who count each successive rape by putting a numbered piece of paper onto a metal spike and knocking two hundred and eight skittles over on a chess board style floor, as ‘the spectator imagines the actions based on sound effects’ (Ciment, 2000: 163). If these sound effects make the scene difficult to watch, the number count make it almost unbearable, as it stresses the prolonged and repetitive nature of this horrifying act. Indeed, by the time he has counted to two hundred and eight, Cosimo is himself exhausted. If *The Baby of Mâcon*, as the last Chapter notes, ultimately lacks the leavening black humour of works such as *Drowning By Numbers*, it also, in the seriousness of this number count, lacks the earlier film’s sense of joy in game playing.

Drowning by Numbers takes literally Greenaway’s assertion that counting is ‘the most simple and primitive of narratives’⁴³ (Greenaway, 1996 (a): 28). It tells the

⁴² See Woods (1996: 166) and Ciment (2000: 162).

⁴³ As Greenaway notes: ‘1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 - [is] a tale with a beginning, a middle and an end and a

story of three women - a grandmother, her daughter and her niece - all named Cissie Colpitts,⁴⁴ who each drown their husbands with the complicity of the local coroner, Madgett. On one level, '[t]he film is constructed from three overlapping narratives - each narrative holding the same sequence of events - three drownings, three autopsies, three funerals, and three reckonings' (Greenaway, 1996 (a): 10). However, the film also features a number-count from 1 to 100, which begins in the opening shot and 'serves as an incidental and ironic structure against which the three woman can drown their husbands' (Greenaway, 1996 (a): 8). Therefore, '[t]wo systems propel the action of the film forward - one is the narrative and one is the numbers. The narrative is the interior skeleton and the number-count is the exterior skeleton' (Greenaway, 1996 (a): 30). This number-count is contained within the text and images in the film. The numbers 1 to 100 appear on screen or are spoken in chronological order through the course of the narrative, and when the count reaches 100, the film ends. For example, the number 'one' appears on a tree in bold white letter after the opening titles, 'two' is written on the side of a tin bath, 'twenty-two' on a copy of *Catch-22*, 'seventy' and 'seventy-one' are the numbers of two runners competing in a marathon, and so on. The count is a kind of game for Greenaway,⁴⁵ which plays upon the artificial nature of film and makes this artificiality explicit to the viewer. The 'numbers represent the ticking away of the frames [...] the allotted

sense of progression - arriving at a finish of two digits, a goal attained, a denouement reached' (Greenaway, 1996 (a): 28).

⁴⁴ As Hacker and Price note Cissie Colpitts, is one of the characters in *The Falls*, 'who had also been glimpsed in *Vertical Features Remake*, and was the lover of the central character [Tulse Luper] in *A Walk Through H* (1991: 204).

⁴⁵ Games are central to Greenaway's work, and to *Drowning By Numbers* in particular. Madgett, the coroner, and his death-obsessed son, Smut, are both master game players and through the course of the film the rules of seven games, many of them rather complex and eccentric games which Madgett has invented, are explained in voiceover as they are played. These seven games provide yet another numerical structure to the film, and the film ends with the seventh: a game of tug-of-war to decide whether or not Madgett should turn the three Cissies in to the police. See Greenaway (1996 (a): 94-112).

time for the narrative to take place. When you reach fifty in the number-count, you know you are half way through the narrative [...] and when you reach one hundred, narrative and number-count arrive neatly at a photo-finish. The film - this artificial construct - is at an end. The game is finished' (Greenaway, 1996 (a): 32).

This numerological game which informed 'every aspect of the form and content and was articulated in the screenplay from the outset' (Woods, 1996: 23) brings *Drowning by Numbers*, at least on a narrative level, closer to Greenaway's earlier avant-garde films, such as *The Falls*, which was more overtly influenced by structural cinema, than it does to Greenaway's more conventional art films such as *Belly of an Architect* (Hacker and Price, 1991: 208). This perhaps should not be surprising as the film was written in 1981, between the filming of *The Falls* and *The Draughtsman's Contract*, when Greenaway, in his own words, was preparing to 'come out of the experimental-movie closet and seek a wider audience' (quoted in Hacker and Price, 1991: 199). However, if films such as *The Draughtsman's Contract* and *The Belly of an Architect*, represent a movement away from the experimentalism of his earlier work 'towards a more conventional engagement with narrative form' (Hill, 2000: 20), many of the formal concerns of his early experimental work have carried over into his feature films, albeit in a slightly tempered form, and an appreciation of Greenaway's experimental films of the 1970s is essential to our understanding of his feature films of the 1980s and 1990s. The next Chapter shall therefore examine the avant-garde roots of Greenaway, as well the work of two other leading directors in British art cinema with backgrounds in the cinematic avant-garde - Jarman and Potter - and shall ultimately assess the varying degrees to which the avant-garde elements of their early work have carried over into their subsequent feature films and the ways in which this makes their work both

interesting, original and critically problematic.

Chapter Four: Avant-Garde Filmmaking¹ and British Art Cinema.

While it is not the place of this thesis to provide a thorough examination of British avant-garde cinema in the last quarter of the twentieth-century,² let alone provide a definition of avant-garde cinema in general, at least a brief examination of the avant-garde is pertinent to any discussion of contemporary British art cinema.

Although critical writing on the subject of avant-garde cinema is quite extensive, there has been ‘little agreement among historians or artists as to what is meant by the term “avant-garde” in relation to film’ (O’Pray, 2003: 1).³ Like art cinema, avant-garde films, when viewed together as a single canon, seem disparate and share few similarities perhaps outside a rejection or critique of key aspects of mainstream cinema (Rees, 1999: 1).⁴

While Bordwell has argued that there is something in art cinema which clearly distinguishes it from ‘*Rio Bravo* on the one hand and *Mothlight* on the other’ (2002: 94), the avant-garde film’s relationship with art cinema is in fact a complex one and

¹ O’Pray notes that the term avant-garde is itself problematic and points out that many commentators have avoided it (1996 (b): 2). However, for convenience, the term here will stand in for other possible variations, such as ‘abstract film’, ‘experimental film’, ‘underground film’, etc. See also Curtis (1971); Dwoskin (1975); Le Grice (1977) and (2001); Gidal (1989); MacDonald (1993); Rees (1999) and Sitney (2002).

² O’Pray notes that there ‘have been very few books on British avant-garde cinema’ (1996 (b): 6), however, for an overview of this period in British *avant-garde* cinema see O’Pray ed. (1996 (b): 219-315) and Dickinson ed. (1999). See also Blanchard and Harvey (1983: 227-241); Harvey (1986: 225-51); Wollen (1993: 35-51); O’Pray (1996 (c): 178-190) and (2003: 107-127) and Rees (1999: 77-120).

³ This thesis will take as a working definition the position that ‘the avant-garde film tradition stems from two broad overlapping concerns. First, it is closely identified with modernism in painting, sculpture and music [...] The second concern is encapsulated in the idea of the ‘underground’ with its connotations of social, sexual and political confrontation with established views, ideas and morals’. (O’Pray (1996 (b): 3-5). However, for other definitions see also Curtis (1971); MacDonald (1993); O’Pray (1996 (b): 1-32), (2003: 1-7); Rees (1996: 1-77); Christie (1998: 449-54); Dixon and Foster (2002: 1-16) and Sitney (2002).

⁴ Even the degree to which the *avant-garde* cinema interacts with the mainstream is a matter of debate amongst filmmakers and critics. As O’Pray writes, ‘[i]f Brakhage saw himself outside the Hollywood system and to some extent, indifferent to it, Godard saw his work as being in opposition to Hollywood, as a negation of it, hence he was intensely interested in it’ (2003: 128).

the distinction between the two is often ‘difficult to sustain’ (O’Pray, 1996 (b): 3).⁵ However, Peter Wollen, in his essay ‘The Two Avant-Gardes’ noted that two distinct avant-garde traditions had formed in European cinema.⁶ The first ‘can be identified loosely with the Co-op movement’ (Wollen, 1993: 133)⁷, the other however, would include filmmakers who operated at the more experimental end of art cinema such as Godard, Jean-Marie Straub and Daniele Huillet and Miklós Jancsó (1993: 133).⁸ Wollen acknowledges the fact that while there are key differences between art cinema and the avant-garde, there is also a potential overlap. Indeed, as O’Pray notes, the ‘energies of the avant-garde were absorbed into a new art cinema in Britain’ (O’Pray, 2002: 109) in the work of Jarman, Greenaway, Potter and later, filmmakers such as Isaac Julien and Patrick Keiller.⁹

Indeed, Jarman, Greenaway and Potter began their careers making experimental films that can be seen as belonging to an international tradition of avant-garde cinema.¹⁰ This chapter shall examine the manner in which these three filmmakers crossed ‘from the avant-garde fringe to a more mainstream style of production’ (Rees, 1999: 98)¹¹ and show the degree to which avant-garde filmmaking styles and techniques have been assimilated into their feature films. Potter, as I shall demonstrate below, ‘moved swiftly [from] the much debated feminist drama *Thriller* (1979) [...] to more expansive 35mm features such as *Orlando* (1992)’ (Rees, 1999:

⁵ Richard Abel, for example, referred to the major European art cinema movements of the 1920s and 1930s - such as German Expressionism, French Impressionism and Soviet Montage - and the work of individual filmmakers such as Gance, Murnau and Dreyer as ‘the narrative avant-garde’ (Abel, 1984). See also Rees (1999: 30-33), Wollen (1996: 134-5) and O’Pray (2003: 2-3).

⁶ See also Rees (1999: 93).

⁷ For more on the Co-op movement in Britain see Blanchard and Harvey (1983: 230-34); Harvey (1986: 236-40) Gidal (1989); Lant (1993: 161-87) and Rees <http://www.lfmc.org/>.

⁸ See also O’Pray (2003: 69-83).

⁹ Due to reasons of length, the work of Julien and Keiller shall not be discussed here. See however, O’Pray (1996 (b)), Attilie et al (1996: 261-274); Rees (1999: 98-107) and Smith (2000 (a): 145-55).

¹⁰ See Rich (1992); Wollen (1993); O’Pray (1996 (b): 178-90); Rees (1999: 98-102) and Curtis (2005).

¹¹ See also O’Pray (2003: 109).

98).¹² Greenaway shifted from the ‘fine art-cum-literary practises of his early work to the far more self-consciously art-house sensibilities’ (O’Pray, 1996 (c): 181) of films such as *The Draughtsman’s Contract*. Finally however, it is Jarman whose relationship with the avant-garde was the most pronounced and complex, and his more experimental features, such as *The Last of England*, *The Garden* and *Blue* tested ‘categorisation to the limits [... and] fused politics and cultural critique with forms taken from avant-garde film as well as art cinema’ (O’Pray, 1996 (b): 21).¹³

Sally Potter’s initial involvement with the arts was as a singer and dancer, giving improvised performances, often with a strong feminist agenda, with her frequent collaborators Rose English, Lindsay Cooper and Jack Stanley.¹⁴ She moved into filmmaking in the late 1970s however, when the role of women filmmakers in Britain was almost entirely restricted to the politically motivated but financially undernourished realms of experimental film collectives such as the London Filmmaker’s Co-Operative, where Potter worked as an editor¹⁵ and the London Women’s Film Group, co-founded by Laura Mulvey.¹⁶ O’Pray has noted that Potter’s first film, *Thriller*, with its ‘black and white deconstruction of an opera [that] played with many elements - dance, opera, theory and acting itself [...] was aligned [...] with Mulvey’s position at the time’ (1996 (b): 16). Like Mulvey’s films of the 1970s, *Penthesilea* and *Riddles of the Sphinx*,¹⁷ Potter’s earliest work is given to ‘experimentation with narrative’ (Mulvey, 1996: 215) and can be read as an attempt to

¹² See also O’Pray (1996 (d): 16).

¹³ See O’Pray (1996 (a): 70-8) and (1996 (c): 178-190) and Rees (1999: 99).

¹⁴ Laura Mulvey notes a small tradition of female avant-garde filmmakers, such as Maya Deren, Yvonne Rainer and Shirley Clarke who began their careers as dancers, stating that the latter was ‘one role in the arts where women are less likely to suffer discrimination and oppression’ (1996: 214). See also Potter (1997: xii-xiii) and Rich (1998: 220-1).

¹⁵ See O’Pray (1996 (b): 16).

¹⁶ For more on the feminist perspectives on British avant-garde film and the work of British female avant-garde filmmakers see Ellis (1977: 121); Harvey (1986: 244); Rich (1992); MacDonald (1992: 333-50); Lant (1993: 161-187); Mulvey (1996: 199-218); Dickinson (1999: 53-55).

develop 'relations between feminism and experimental film and psychoanalysis' (Mulvey, 1996: 215).¹⁸

B. Ruby Rich has described *Thriller* as the 'first feminist murder mystery' (Rich, 1998: 227). A riff on Puccini's opera *La Bohème*, the film centres on the ill-fated central female character, Mimi, a poor and ailing seamstress who dies of consumption in her lover's arms in the opera's finale. However, at the start of Potter's film, Mimi has been resurrected and is trying to piece together the circumstances of her death. When the famous strains of Puccini's opera that open the film are interrupted by Bernard Herrmann's equally famous music for the shower scene in Hitchcock's *Psycho*, one begins to understand that there has been foul play. Mimi it seems was murdered in the name of art. But Potter stresses that she is far from alone, indeed, 'hundreds of women characters throughout history, plus the consciousness of millions of women subjected to the fiction' (Rich, 1998: 230) have fallen victim to the whims of male artists like Puccini, who have 'murdered' women in the name of art, entertainment, fame and money. Certainly, the history of art bears Potter out, from operas like *La Bohème* or *Manon*, to novels such as *Madame Bovary*, *Anna Karenina*, and *Effi Briest*, hundreds of women have indeed been sacrificed by male artists in this way. Furthermore, as the film points out, Mimi and her fellow female victims, exist in a situation of eternal return, and will be murdered again and

¹⁷ Co-directed with Peter Wollen.

¹⁸ The place of narrative in the avant-garde film was a heavily contested one in Britain in the 1970s (see O'Pray, 1996 (b): 16). For Mulvey and Wollen however, experimentation with narrative was central to their theory and practice of film. Wollen had noted in 'The Two Avant-Gardes', that there was a tradition going 'back to Eisenstein and Vertov, influenced by Brecht, re-emerging with the late work of Goddard [that] has broken down the demarcations between fact and fiction and laid a foundation for experimentation with narrative' (Mulvey, 1996: 216). See also Wollen (1996: 133-144). Mulvey, in turn used this as a defence of her own theory of feminist avant-garde film, stating that 'Women cannot be satisfied with an aesthetics that restricts counter-cinema to work on form alone. Feminism is bound to politics: its experiment cannot exclude work on content' (1996: 213). Therefore, film such as *Riddles of the Sphinx* feature a 'systematic investigation and practical taking apart of traditional narrative' (Harvey, 1986: 238).

again, each time the opera or play is staged, or the novel read.

Rich saw the film as presenting a challenge not only to the traditional modes of representation, particularly of women, in dominant cinema, but also to the traditions of the avant-garde itself. Rich even recalls a screening of *Thriller* and a lecture by Potter at the School of the Art Institute in Chicago, where Stan Brakhage, ‘the most important [...] and influential avant-garde filmmaker of the post-war period’ (O’Pray, 2003: 58), openly attacked her film in an attempt to ‘guard the fortress of the avant-garde against this interloper whose film was so clearly a challenge to everything he and his films represented’ (Rich, 1998: 221). Although initially influenced by the trance films of Deren and Anger, his work ultimately became quite distinct, and by the late 1950s, Brakhage had largely departed from psychodrama and began to ‘emphasise the formal qualities of film’ and ‘embrace abstractions’ (O’Pray, 2003: 58-61). Potter’s film moves in quite the opposite direction, however, and is ‘concerned with the purposes and social function of storytelling’ (Harvey, 1986: 241) ‘rather than the formal film tradition’ (O’Pray, 1996 (c): 184).¹⁹ Furthermore, for all of its complexity, *Thriller* also has an amazing clarity and accessibility. Potter, for the unfamiliar, explains and summarises the four acts of Puccini’s opera, a concession to the audience that is uncommon, if not unthinkable, in the work of a filmmakers such as Brakhage, who in works such as *Dog Star Man* (1962-4) and *The Dante Quartet* (1987), which draw heavily on Homer and Dante, expects a knowledge of the text by his viewers. Therefore, in the length of one short film, Potter manages to attack both the negative treatment and representation of women in western art, and the formalism, intellectual snobbery and elitism of much

¹⁹ This again brings Potter’s work close to that of Mulvey, who was not only ‘drawn to the utilisation and transformation of narrative forms’ (Harvey, 1986: 238), but who also noted that she and Wollen

avant-garde cinema.

Perhaps unusually for an avant-garde film, *Thriller* seeks to entertain as well as challenge its audience. In Potter's first feature, *The Gold Diggers*, the opening song, 'Pleasure Time Blues', states: 'Please give me back my good night out/Please give me back my pleasure time'.²⁰ However, as the film progresses, one realises that Potter has not merely set out to make ninety minutes of escapist entertainment. On the contrary, the film is designed to make the audience 'questions traditions of female representation in photographic pornography, fine art, household magazines, and film, by asking what kind of structures link market economy, female imagery, and women's struggles' (Lant, 1993: 171). However, the plea in 'Pleasure Time Blues' is also a genuine one, as the entertainment offered by cinema, which usually comes at the expense of women, has been ruined for the women who made *Thriller* and *The Gold Diggers*. These films then mark an attempt to redress this gender imbalance, as they attack female cinematic stereotypes such as the hapless victim of melodrama or the immoral and corrupting *femme fatale* of the *film noir*.

The Gold Diggers then 'continues some of the concerns of *Thriller* in investigating the parts allocated to women in traditional film narrative, and women's place in relationships of power and wealth' (Harvey, 1986: 244). At its centre is the character of Ruby, played by Julie Christie, who like Mimi in *Thriller* is a victim of the male dominance of art. Potter plays with the audience's familiarity with Christie's previous films and her status as an international star and sex symbol.²¹ In one particularly notable scene, Christie is seen in a ballroom, surrounded by dozens of

'didn't want a [filmmaking] system like Brakhage's' (MacDonald, 1992: 334).

²⁰ The final line of the Potter's accompanying statement for the film at its NFT premiere read: 'ultimately my own desire was and is to give pleasure; to heal the 'Pleasure Time Blues' of the opening song'. BFI Unpublished Collections, *The Gold Diggers*, Box 1.

²¹ See Geraghty (1997: 154-66).

men, all rendered physically indistinguishable by their matching tuxedos. In turn, each of the men claim their 'right' to dance with her, and like an object at once fragile and desirable, she is passed from man to man. Then a figure storms into the ballroom on a white charger and rescues her from the hoard of anonymous men. The figure on the horse is Celeste, a black woman of French origins, whose colour, accent and sexual ambiguities (she, unlike Christie, dresses largely like a man, in combat fatigues and the like), make her both decidedly different from Ruby, and almost unrecognisable as a female 'type' in cinema. The sequence is all the more effective for being shot without dialogue, with only the music in the ballroom playing on the soundtrack. This immediately conjures associations in the viewer's mind of silent melodramas such as Griffith's *Broken Blossoms* or *Way Down East* and brilliantly inverts the antiquated notion of the damsel in distress. Once rescued, Ruby begins to tell Celeste about her history, and how she and her mother were both heroines in a melodrama, and were forced to suffer over and over the indignities of such a character. This melodramatic suffering, with both mother and daughter threatened by blizzards and hostile men in an isolated cabin, is reminiscent of Griffith's *Orphans of the Storm*. Aesthetically, however, Ruby's long address to the camera also recalls Anna Karina's monologues in Godard's *Vivre sa Vie* (1962).

This kind of intertextual referencing is typical of Potter's work. She often seeks to juxtapose and reconcile seemingly incompatible influences on her films. To coincide with the film's British release, Potter was asked by Sheila Whittaker, then newly appointed head of the National Film Theatre, to select a program of films that influenced *The Gold Diggers*. In this 'Gold Diggers Season', Potter concentrated not only on influences but also films that were 'a contemplation of femaleness, the split female identity, or simply dwelling on the iconic power of the female face on

screen'.²² Included in the program were films such as *Darling* and *Doctor Zhivago* (both 1965), which established Julie Christie as a star, European art films by great directors of women such as Bergman and Max Ophüls, and avant-garde films by women directors such as Germaine Dulac and Maya Deren.²³ This eclectic selection of films can indeed help the viewer to contextualise Potter's ambitions and intentions in *The Gold Diggers*, where references to classic Hollywood, 'women's' cinema, film noir, European art cinema and modernist and more contemporary avant-garde film are spun into an intertextual web designed to replay and deconstruct the first century of cinema from a feminist point of view. However, in this regard, Potter's film can be read as being too ambitious and clever, and it often runs the risk of falling into didacticism. Despite some acclaim at international film festivals, *The Gold Diggers* was critically maligned on its initial release. Critics such as Frances Dickson argued that Potter's off screen experiment with *The Gold Diggers*, namely the coup of assembling an entirely female crew to make the film, all of whom, including Potter and the 'star', Julie Christie, were paid the same daily wage, seemed a more successful criticism of and challenge to the traditional place of women on film and the Hollywood system than the heady cocktail of popular, art and avant-garde cinema on display on screen (Dickson, 2002: 450).

The review of the film in the leading American film industry paper, *Variety*,

²² From the BFI collection on *The Gold Digger*, box 1.

²³ The complete 'Gold Diggers Season' included Chaplin's *The Gold Rush* (1925), Griffith's *Way Down East* (1920), Hitchcock's *The Lady Vanishes* (1938), Rouben Mamoulian's *Queen Christina* (1933), Eisenstein's *Alexander Nevsky* (1938), Wojciech Has' *The Saragossa Manuscript* (1965), Schlesinger's *Darling* (1965), *Lola Montes* (1953) and *Madame de...* (1955), H.C. Potter's *Hellzapoppin'* (1941), Welles' *The Trial* (1962), Bergman's *Persona* (1966), Mervyn LeRoy's *The Gold Diggers of 1933* (1933), Alexander Kluge's *The Power of Emotions* (1983), Wim Wenders' *The State of Things* (1982), Slatan Dudow and Bertolt Brecht's *Kuhle Wampe* (1932), Yvonne Rainer's *Lives of Performers* (1972), Powell and Pressburger's *The Red Shoes*, Dorothy Arzner's *Dance Girl Dance* (1940). The short films were: Dulac's *The Smiling Madame Beudet* (1922), Deren's *Meshes in the Afternoon* (1942), *At Land* (1944) and *Study in Choreography for the Camera* (1945), Peter Kubelka's *Adebar* (1957) and *Schwechater* (1958), Joyce Wieland's *Rat Life and Diet in America*

noted that the film would most likely have an ‘extremely limited audience’ at feminist and avant-garde film festivals, and that:

The radical filmmaker can either coat the pill in the trappings of commercial cinema and thus hope to get his/her message across to a large audience; or he/she can be resolutely uncompromising, as in this case, and thus risk preaching only to the converted (Anonymous, 1983: 26).

Potter seems to have heeded this advice, and her subsequent films, *Orlando*, *The Tango Lesson*, *The Man Who Cried* (2000) and *Yes* (2004) mark a pronounced departure from the radicalism of *Thriller* and *The Gold Diggers* towards commercial cinema. Although these films retain much of the focus on sexual politics explored in her more avant-garde work, the pill has most certainly been coated by such mainstream trappings as larger budgets, colour photography, lavish costume design, exotic international locations, and clearly identifiable characters and narratives. *Orlando*, for example, is an adaptation of Virginia Woolf’s novel, which at times seems to belong as much to the essentially conservative tradition of British heritage cinema²⁴ as it does to contemporary British art cinema.²⁵ The reasons for this calculated move towards the mainstream are not hard to explain, however.

The increasing preference for more commercially viable low-budget features across the board with British film financiers such as the BFI, Channel Four and British

(1968), and Potter’s own *Thriller*. From the BFI collection on *The Gold Digger*, box 1.

²⁴ See Higson (1996: 232-48).

²⁵ Potter, in *Orlando*, consciously aligns herself with the work of her contemporaries in British art cinema, including Ken Russell, Jarman and Greenaway. These links can be seen through a number of references and intertextual allusions to their work, not least the casting of Tilda Swinton. Jarman’s muse, in the title role and Potter’s poaching of Jarman’s costume designer, Sandy Powell and Greenaway’s art directors, Jan Roefls and Ben Van Os. See also Willoquet-Maricondi (2001 (b): 307-

Screen, all of whom were hungry to repeat the unexpected success of a low-budget narrative film such as *The Draughtsman's Contract* or *My Beautiful Laundrette* (1985) and meant that the climate in the British film industry was less suited to filmmakers wishing to experiment. This fact, coupled with the outright critical hostility with which *The Gold Diggers* met upon its initial release, meant that Potter had little choice but to opt for a safer and more marketable option with her next film. The literary adaptation, as its prevalence in the history of cinema will attest, is a particularly safe option. Producers, as well as filmmakers, are often drawn to adapting novels and plays as they provide both a pre-fabricated structure and characters, as well as a built-in audience demographic, made up of the original novel's admirers.²⁶ Furthermore, in the case of a film such as *Orlando*, which adapts a 'high-brow' literary work, there exists a certain cultural caché, wherein the artistic merits of the novel are in effect borrowed by the film and built up before its release. Ultimately, one must accept that *Orlando* was partially designed to reconsolidate Potter's position and box-office viability after a commercial failure. It more than succeeded in its task, drawing in large audiences and even garnering the 'Oscar' nominations so coveted by the British film industry.²⁷ Indeed, the use of Woolf's novel as a source was an astute choice on Potter's part, and even if *Orlando* finally does not represent the 'future of feminist filmmaking' (Rich 1998: 221) that Rich and others saw her earlier work promising, the novel's theme of the disinheritance of women, through the very arbitrary fact of their gender, allows Potter to allegorically continue the examination of women's place in cinema that she began in *Thriller* and *The Gold Diggers*, whilst also allowing her to slyly comment on her own marginalized place in British film

8), Ciecko (2002: 276) and Hoyle (2005: 207-10).

²⁶ See McFarland (1986: 120-42) and (1996).

industry.²⁸

If *Orlando* exists in ambiguous space in-between costume drama and art cinema, Jarman and Greenaway have made similar films, such as *The Draughtsman's Contract* and *Carravaggio*²⁹ which on the surface seem to divorce them from their avant-garde roots and bring 'them closer to the British drama and history film than either perhaps could have wished' (Rees, 1999: 101).

Perhaps the best illustration of this transition from avant-garde experimentation towards more commercial modes of filmmaking by these directors comes in the form of a comparison between Greenaway's two major works of the early 1980s, *The Falls* and *The Draughtsman's Contract*. This short period marks a shift in Greenaway's filmmaking from avant-garde experimentalism towards a more commercial form of art-house feature filmmaking. The latter film, somewhat misguidedly, is often referred to as Greenaway's debut feature, when in actuality, it is only his commercial debut. *The Falls* runs for more than three hours, and is therefore of (rather extended) feature length. Furthermore, it was the first British film in over thirty years to win the BFI Special Award, a coveted prize for feature films, awarded at the London Film Festival.³⁰ However, the tendency not to regard the film as a 'legitimate' feature remains strong amongst mainstream critics. Although, like *Thriller*, *The Falls* 'leans heavily towards narrative' (O'Pray, 1996 (c): 184), critics

²⁷ The film was nominated for two Academy Awards: Best Costume Design (Sandy Powell) and Best Art Direction (Jan Roefels and Ben Van Os).

²⁸ Potter, one could argue, is doubly marginalized, both as an art film director and as a female filmmaker in Britain. As Antonia Lant notes, the number of women feature filmmakers working in Britain has always been few; 'no women directed within the admittedly modest [British] commercial sector in the eighties' (1993: 161-2) and there is no British equivalents of powerful mainstream American female directors such as 'Susan Seidelman, Kathryn Bigelow or Penny Marshall' (1993: 161). However, *Orlando* was 'enough of a success to win [Potter] the chance to make [...] *The Tango Lesson*' (Rich, 1992: 229), a far more personal film, based on Potter's original, semi-autobiographical screenplay, and with the director also taking the lead female role.

²⁹ See Wymer (2005: 98-99).

³⁰ See Hacker and Price (1991: 189).

such as Chris Auty have noted that the film is '[n]ot [...] for those who like one story, two characters and a happy ending' (Auty, 2002 (b): 366). *The Falls* takes the form of a purposely-sprawling government commissioned documentary that centres on ninety-two survivors of a fictitious 'Violent Unknown Event' (V.U.E.). These ninety-two survivors, arbitrarily chosen by the Ministry of Information for the purposes of the film due to the fact that their surnames all begin with the letters FALL, are interviewed individually and alphabetically, and there is almost no interaction or dialogue between any characters in the film, only personal testimonies, spoken in a variety of languages, several of them invented, and an authoritative BBC style voiceover, reading short biographies of each of the subjects.

The Falls is the culmination of Greenaway's work as an experimental filmmaker, both in its ambition and in its development on his previous works, most notably *A Walk Through H* and *Vertical Features Remake* (1978). However, for Simon Field, Greenaway's experimental films occupy a 'paradoxical place [...] within the spectrum of [British] independent film-making' (1981: 49) and being neither radically politically nor radically 'formalist' or 'materialist' they do not find a place 'within the ubiquitous model of the two avant-gardes' (1981: 49). Furthermore, Field believes that Greenaway is 'unconcerned with matter of radical and experimental visual form that have characterised the avant-garde' (1981: 49) since the 1960s and has rather 'almost entirely and wholeheartedly [adopted] the rhetoric of certain dominant, or commercial film forms - specifically that of the short, information documentary, such as one images might be produced at the Central Office of Information' (1981: 49). While Field, as the last Chapter demonstrated, is quite justified in his later claims that Greenaway's films 'are excessively literary' (1981:

50)³¹ and perhaps belong only problematically to the avant-garde, he overlooks the fact that Greenaway in fact worked for the Central Office of Information as an editor and *A Walk Through H*, *Vertical Feature Remake* and *The Falls* are all mock documentaries that parody the films he assembled there.³²

The films Greenaway had to edit, by his own admission, were about the ‘organisation of ephemera [such as] how many sheepdogs are there in South Wales? [or] how many Japanese restaurants are there in Ipswich?’ (Pally, 2000: 107-8). These government commissioned films, as David Pascoe notes, were ‘designed to portray the strange intricacies of the British way of life through numbers and statistics [and began] Greenaway’s formal examination of the artifice inherent in systems of categorizing’ (1997: 49). *Vertical Features Remake*, presents itself as a filmed record, made for the mythical ‘Institute of Reclamation and Restoration’ (IRR), of all ‘vertical features’ - trees, lampposts, telephone polls, fences, goal posts etc - to be found within one square kilometre in the town of Glasbury-on-Wye in Herefordshire. However, Greenaway’s main concern, as it would often be in his subsequent feature films, is not the information itself, the vertical features of the title, but rather the way in which this information is arranged. The coup of the film is to have the character of Tulse Luper, the apocryphal hero of Greenaway’s final three experimental films, a fictitious ornithologist, author and employee of the ‘Institute of Reclamation and Restoration’ (IRR), die at the start of the film, leaving the footage he shot for the IRR film, ‘Vertical Features’, unassembled. Greenaway’s film then becomes a poker-faced ‘pastiche of bureaucratic delirium’ (Andrews, 2000: 3) and academic bickering as the

³¹ Even, as Field notes, ‘from the perspective of the avant-garde associated with the London Filmmaker’s Co-op that has been far more concerned with narrative’ (1981: 49-50) than other branches of the avant-garde. It is unlikely that Greenaway would dispute this however, and he has himself described *The Falls* as ‘a catalogue movie, made with an enthusiasm for *Tristram Shandy*, Borges, and Thornton Wilder’s *The Bridge of San Luis Rey*’ (Gras, 2000: xiv).

IRR attempt to construct the film based on Luper's posthumous instructions. These instructions are interpreted in several different ways, leading to four alternate versions of the film: the 'remakes' of the title. The result is even more absurd than a documentary about the 'aesthetic-ecological significance' (Andrews, 2000: 3) of the vertical features present in a certain area, but a documentary about the different ways of assembling a documentary about the same.

A.L. Rees has noted that the film is also 'a parody of structural cinema, imbued with its style and obsessions, but counter to its internalised ambitions' (1999: 99).³² In his study of American avant-garde cinema, *Visionary Film*, P. Adams Sitney described the structural film as a film 'in which the shape [...] is predetermined and simplified, and it is that shape which is the primal impression of the film' (2002: 348). Each version of *Vertical Features* shows one hundred and twenty-one such features, arranged into groups of eleven, as the number eleven, when written, itself has two vertical features, and therefore is in keeping with the spirit of the project. However, in each version a different structure is applied to the presentation of the one hundred and twenty-one objects. For example, the first version begins with a shot of eleven frames and each successive shot is extended by one frame, resulting in a final shot of one hundred and thirty-two frames, and with each shot counted in a sequence from one to eleven times. The third version begins with a shot of only one frame, with each successive shot extended by one frame and a count that goes in sequence from one to one hundred and twenty-one. Taken alone, these films would not be atypical of the work of structural filmmakers such as Hollis Frampton, whom Greenaway greatly admired. For example, Frampton's major work, *Zorn's Lemma* (1970), plays a similar

³² See Rees (1999: 99).

³³ Greenaway supports this, stating in his introduction to the recent BFI DVD release of the film

game with the alphabet.³⁴ In one of the three sections of the film, Frampton arranges a series of one-second shots of words, all, like the vertical features in Greenaway's film taken from *objects trouvés*, such as signs and billboards, and arranges them into alphabetical sequence as a woman recites the alphabet in voiceover. Subsequently, Frampton begins to substitute letters with 'an image without a sign. The first to go is X, replaced by a fire; a little later Z is replaced by waves breaking backwards' (Sitney, 2002: 367). The result of this is that 'by the close of this section, Frampton has fabricated a unique pictorial alphabet, existing beyond rule or logic, each image correlated to a single letter' (Pascoe, 1997: 52).

While Greenaway's film borrows the exacting shot length and fixed camera positions of *Zorn's Lemma* and other structural films,³⁵ it differs from them in other key ways. While the 'structural film insists on its shape, and what content it has is minimal and subsidiary to the outline' (Sitney, 2002: 348), the fictional interludes that precede each subsequent 'remake' of Luper's film set Greenaway's film apart from this particular mode of structural avant-garde filmmaking. Indeed, Greenaway's film seems to have a surplus of content. These fictional sequences, in which an array of academics postulate and argue over the definitive means of organising Luper's information, were 'an excuse to explain the methodology, always a structuralist bane' (BFI DVD 2004) and also formulate Greenaway's ironic and wittily mocking critique of structural theory. These sequences present the viewer with a concentrated rush of 'content' to complement the form of the work. At least a dozen academics and related characters are named, including van Hoyten and Cissie Colpitts, to whom Greenaway would return in *A Zed and Two Noughts* and *Drowning by Numbers* respectively, and

(2004), that the film is 'both a celebration and critique of structuralist theory'.

³⁴ For a more detailed examination of Frampton's film, see Sitney (2002: 367-70).

it is difficult, even after repeated viewings, to keep track of which characters posited which theories on Luper's work. However, Greenaway was unconcerned with conventional notions of characterisation and motivation at this stage of his career. He was interested in experimenting with cinema's abilities to both arrange images and tell stories, an experiment he continued in his next work, *A Walk Through H* and took to excess in *The Falls*.

A Walk Through H, subtitled 'The Reincarnation of an Ornithologist', is an elaborate fiction in the mould of Borges, in which the soul of a deceased unseen narrator must find its way to heaven or hell (two of the possible 'H's of the title) by using ninety-two maps arranged into order by his friend and fellow ornithologist Tulse Luper. Visually, the film consists of these ninety-two maps, all drawn and painted, then filmed by Greenaway. Through this simple visual device Greenaway conjures up a host of memorably surreal and abstract images that deconstruct each of the maps, through close-ups and elegant and detailed movement of the camera. *A Walk Through H* thus represents Greenaway's most complete, and certainly most literal, attempt to realise his ambition of merging the vocabularies of painting and film, an example of the merging of film with other art forms typical of the avant-garde. On one level, the film can simply be viewed as a filmed record of one of Greenaway's painting exhibitions, as the opening and closing shots of the film reveal the ninety-two 'maps' to be hanging on the walls of an art gallery. However, when combined with the vocabulary of cinema, such as the close-up and pan, these paintings cannot only be viewed and appreciated with a detail and closeness almost impossible in a gallery, they can also be imbued with (greater) narrative significance. Taken individually, the paintings in *A Walk Through H* have little or no apparent narrative in conventional

³⁵ See Sitney (2002: 348).

terms, but rather tend to be abstract paintings or collages more concerned with form, colour and symmetry than with telling a story. Taken together, in the context of the film, the paintings take on a collective narrative in the form of the narrator's journey. While this could perhaps be accomplished by viewing the paintings in sequence in a gallery, the effect would be greatly diminished, as the narrative is provided in the film's voiceover, and the illusion of the narrator's progression from one map to the next made far more smooth through the film's editing. Ultimately, *A Walk Through H* is the genesis of Greenaway's subsequent multimedia projects, which typically combine related work in film, television and exhibited art, such as *The Stairs* (1994-5), a film of his exhibition of the same name held in Geneva and Munich on aspects of cinema, such as 'location' and 'projection'. This refusal to limit his projects to a single medium displays a spirit typical of the avant-garde, which historically was populated by filmmakers who began their careers in other mediums, rather than at film school, such as the poets Jean Cocteau and Frampton, the novelist Jean Genet, musicians and performers such as Maya Deren and Sally Potter, and painters such as Brakhage, Jarman and Greenaway. Furthermore, the almost total independence with which Greenaway made *Vertical Features Remake*, *A Walk Through H* and many of his other early films, is also in keeping with the spirit of the avant-garde which seeks to reject the compromises that are often imposed by both the expensive and collaborative nature of feature filmmaking. Greenaway has himself noted that he has a 'great problem [...] with the collaborative necessities of actors, crew [and] finances' (Smith, 2000: 94), and in his feature films, the necessity of working with actors and collaborators, and the pressures of narrative, have meant that Greenaway's attempts to bring painting and cinema together can only go so far. For example, in features such as *A Zed and Two Noughts* and *The Cook, The Thief, His Wife and Her*

Lover, as in Jarman's *Caravaggio*, he can both recreate famous works of art as *tableaux vivants* and seeks to bring a more painterly sense of lighting and aesthetics to cinema, but in *A Walk Through H* he was free to dispose of both actors and, to a large degree, narrative, and instead his paintings provide both the imagery and the characters, as each map in turn has its own story within the overall structure of the journey.

Despite the autonomy that Greenaway had over the film, *A Walk Through H* was his first film to be produced by the British Film Institute Production Board rather than more private or independent means, and therefore brought him closer to the realms of industrial cinema that he had ever ventured. For example, with the exception of composers such as Michael Nyman and Brian Eno, and voiceover artist Colin Cantile, who narrated the majority of Greenaway's early films, Greenaway was not used to working with a crew, but rather, followed the more do-it-yourself model of avant-garde and independent filmmaking, after acting as his own photographer, editor, production designer and producer. However, *The Falls* was so vast an undertaking that it required two cinematographers and editors, not including Greenaway himself, and no less than six narrators. The film, unlike any of his previous efforts, also featured a large number of speaking parts for actors, as the vast majority of the ninety-two interviewed survivors of the V.U.E. are both seen and heard on screen.

Auty notes that the film again substitutes 'an amazing excess of content for the formalism that (usually) characterises the avant-garde' (2002 (b): 366). and each of the biographies is in itself a work of short fiction, ranging greatly in tone, content and length. However, many of the interviewees reveal links to Greenaway's previous films: there are ninety-two interviewees, which equals the number of maps in *A Walk Through H*, many of them also reveal a strange empathy with birds and the act of

flying as a result of the V.U.E, and several list their favourite stories by Tulse Luper, which are then read in part. For example, Biography 16 of 'Ipson and Pulat Fallari', tells of identical twins,³⁶ born illegitimately to different mothers, who were themselves twin sisters. The 'twins' are inseparable to the point of sharing a wife and were both pilots, rendered narcoleptic and therefore unable to fly as a result of the V.U.E.. Additionally, and again as a result of the V.U.E., they begin to speak different languages - Allow and Capistan, the phonics and phonetics of which are described at length by the film's linguistic 'expert' - and thus part ways. Another simply says 'Biography 80 *Ascrib Fallstaff*: Pernicious inclusion of fictional character. Criminal charges are pending' (Greenaway 1993 (a): 109), over a black screen.

Greenaway admitted that the film need not be watched in one sitting, nor even in order to be appreciated. Rather, he encourages viewers to treat the film as a sort of filmic reference book, to dip in and out of when the need arises.³⁷ Thus the structure of the film, which proceeds alphabetically through the interviews, is ultimately rather arbitrary. This, of course, is a practical impossibility in a cinema, where films are shown from the beginning, in sequence and in their entirety, and in this way Greenaway's film seems to have looked ahead to the advent of home video, and it is perhaps only now that technology has caught up with its maker's intentions that *The Falls* can be fully appreciated. Indeed, a recent DVD release of the film has enabled viewers to see the ninety-two entries in a variety of sequential orders, and subdivided the biographies into (sometimes overlapping) categories, such as 'Missing and Deceased' or 'Tulse Luper's Fiends and Enemies', thus creating a number of smaller

³⁶ Played by British animators and filmmakers Timothy and Stephen Quay.

³⁷ See Hacker and Price (1991: 199).

versions of *The Falls*.³⁸ Certainly, this looseness about chronology and refusal to insist that his film needs to be watched in one sitting, runs contrary to conventional notions of dominant cinema, where the privileging of narrative above all else would mean that to watch a film in stages, and in the 'wrong' order, would be detrimental to the accumulative effect of the story and thus nullify the purpose of the film.

The Falls cost little more than £40,000 to make and replaced an overall narrative structure with an excess of smaller narratives disregarding conventional portrayals of character. *The Draughtsman's Contract*, on the other hand,

was the first film for which Greenaway had reasonable financial backing; it was the first time he had access to a large public; the first film for which he put together a linear narrative; and the first time that he scripted characters and their dialogue (Pascoe, 1997: 71).

Although this shift must in part be accounted for by Greenaway's ambition to move into feature filmmaking in the tradition of Resnais, Fellini and Antonioni, it is equally the result of Peter Sainsbury's decision to begin backing low-budget features that had increased commercial viability. Unquestionably, Sainsbury's influence and his experience as a producer and financier of films had an overwhelming effect on the final version of Greenaway's film, which, based on the writer-director's original conception, would perhaps have been closer to *The Falls*. In the version finally released in 1982, *The Draughtsman's Contract* is structured around a complex,

³⁸ This idea of encouraging the viewer to rearrange the sequence of a film is not entirely without precedence. Frampton's *Hapax Legomena* (1971-2), consisted of seven films released in non-sequential order over two years. The seven parts of *Hapax Legomena* were released in the following order: Part IV: *Travelling Matte*, Part I: *Nostalgia*, Part III: *Critical Mass* all in 1971 and Part V: *Ordinary Matter*, Part VI: *Remote Control*, Part VII: *Special Effects*, and Part II: *Poetic Justice* in 1972. The intention was that the seven parts could be viewed in any possible sequence, therefore

unresolved, though ultimately linear and comprehensible narrative, in which Mr. Neville, a talented but arrogant draughtsman with social aspirations, is commissioned to draw twelve elevations of the country estate belonging to Mr Herbert, by his wife. However, the artist's commission is not without its complications and perks. As a deal is struck, the contract of the title, whereby Mrs Herbert consents to have sexual relations with Mr Neville each day in return for the drawings. As the plot unravels, the estate's owner, Mr Herbert, is found drowned in the moat. It is revealed that he inherited the house from his wife's father and that his murder may have been a conspiracy between Mrs. Herbert, and Mrs. Talmann, her daughter and only child, who has a loveless and childless marriage to an impotent German aristocrat, and draws up a similar contract with Mr Neville, whereby she may have her pleasure with him, in the hope of conceiving a son to inherit her mother's rightful estate. By the close of the film, Mr Neville, who, like the photographer in Antonioni's *Blow-Up*, unwittingly records evidence of the Mr Herbert's murder in his drawings, is framed for the crime and is murdered by the conspirators. The true identity of Mr Herbert's murderer is never revealed.

Greenaway had planned the film as another epic, dealing with a host of characters and sub-plots excised from the final theatrical version. His original cut reportedly lasted over four hours, but as James Park notes,

[e]ven in the relatively non-commercial area, it is possible for the producer to introduce elements that will make a film more accessible [and] Sainsbury [...] has encouraged filmmakers working with BFI finance to cast their scripts within a narrative structure, use well known names in the cast, and

resulting in a new film experience each time. See also Sitney (2002: 377-83).

employ skilled technicians to secure the highest production values possible with a low budget. (Park, 52-3).

Sainsbury further convinced the director to part with over two hours of material, which, in Greenaway's words had to do with:

symbolism, allegory, the relationship of people upstairs and downstairs, and the continuation of the living-statue conceit. (The statue had a wife and a dog.) All the minor characters played the game of aping their masters. Maria, Mrs. Herbert's servant, and Philip, Mr. Neville's assistant, had sexual liaisons after dark in the same places that the drawings were made. Also, the mechanical manipulation of the drawings was shown stage by stage, as well as a scene where Porringer attacks Mr. Neville in the garden, accusing him of various relations with his mistress (Morgan, 2000: 13).³⁹

In this way, the 110-minute theatrical release of *The Draughtsman's Contract* represented not only a major change of policy and direction within the British Film Institute,⁴⁰ but also a marked departure for Greenaway, who began to learn the art of making commercial feature films, and had his first success, albeit a modest one by convention Hollywood standards, at the box-office. Yet 'Sainsbury's aim to maximise the audience for films which are innovative in their use of the film medium [...] brought strong criticism from experimental filmmakers who interpreted such measures as attempts to compromise the director's creative integrity' (Park, 1984 52-

³⁹ A review of the film in *The Guardian* remarked that perhaps 'the four-hour which may one day become available is clearer if not more concise' (see Walker, 1999: 242).

3). However, an examination of *The Draughtsman's Contract*, even in its shortened theatrical version, demonstrates that it is unquestionably Greenaway's work, and that in his move toward the mainstream, he 'had not turned away from the concerns of his previous works and the film carries through the formal pattern of his art' (Pascoe, 1997: 71).

Firstly, Greenaway's script is full of the same dry wit, puns, and smaller narratives extending from the central conceit as *A Walk Through H* or *The Falls*, however, it now takes the form of dialogue between characters, who are usually telling stories to one another, rather than the more impersonal voiceover narration of the earlier mock documentaries. Secondly, the film, with its setting around the vast estates of a country house, shares the fascination with British landscape that clearly manifests itself in work such as *Vertical Features Remake*. Thirdly, it retains the formal, and indeed, numerical, structure of his early films; however, the structure is here based around the twelve drawings Mr Neville is commissioned to make, which are used to subdivide the narrative. Finally, the film retains Greenaway's concern with melding cinema with the other, older arts, and painting in particular. This can be seen not only through the central importance of the twelve drawings to the plots of the film (both the narrative of the commissioning of the Draughtsman and their importance to the 'plot' to murder Mr Herbert), and the manner in which Greenaway films the progress of these drawings in close detail, like the maps in *A Walk Through H*, but also in the film's constant reference to the act of framing. Throughout the film, and in the twelve drawing sequences that make up the 'organising principle' of this particular film, Mr Neville is seen to be framing the house, or is himself framed. (just as he is also 'framed' for the murder), through a perspectival apparatus. With its

⁴⁰ See also Rees (1999: 90-93).

constant presence, often sub-dividing the screen into a varying number of symmetrical parts, Greenaway is able to make parallels between the act of framing a shot for a film and the act of painting a picture.

The feature films Greenaway made in the 1980s, after *The Draughtsman's Contract*,⁴¹ established his reputation as one of the leading figures in international art cinema.⁴² Like their predecessor, these films were also carefully scripted, shot and edited in a conventional manner, and featured linear plots and professional actors. However, in more recent films, such as *The Pillow Book*, Greenaway has not entirely dispensed with the above attributes but has also 'turned to full multi-media production' (Rees, 1999: 99). His most recent work, *The Tulse Luper Suitcases*, not only builds on the formal and technological experiments of *The Pillow Book*, 'weaving text, image and light in a digital collage which overtly alludes to high modernism and post-cubist space' (Rees, 1999: 99), it also makes direct links to earlier experimental work such as *Vertical Features Remake* and *The Falls*. This multi-media project, which involves three feature films,⁴³ a series of interactive CD-ROMS, a touring art exhibition, a book and an accompanying television program, resurrects the characters - Luper, Cissie Colepitts and van Hoyten - and narrative preoccupations of his early films to bring Greenaway's work full circle.⁴⁴

Rees has noted that Greenaway's relatively recent return to more experimental modes of feature filmmaking, 'parallels Jarman's enthusiasm, towards the end of his life, for breeding new cinematic cross-breeds between Super-8, 16mm and video

⁴¹ *A Zed and Two Noughts* (1985), *The Belly of an Architect* (1987), *Drowning By Numbers* (1988) and *The Cook, The Thief, His Wife and Her Lover* (1989).

⁴² See Woods (1996: 3-10); Hill (2000: 18-19); Jones (2000: 187) and Willoquet-Maricondi and Alemany-Galway (2001: xii).

⁴³ The three feature films that comprise the *The Tulse Luper Suitcases* are: *Part 1: The Moab Story* (2003); *Part 2: Vaux to the Sea* (2004) and *Part 3: From Sark to the Finish* (2003).

⁴⁴ For more on the project see Danek (2000: 190-94).

editing' (1999: 99). Indeed, as O'Pray notes, '[i]n a reversal of most director's careers, Jarman's film style became moer radical as he grew older' (1996 (a): 9). His earlier features - *Sebastiane*, *Jubilee* and *The Tempest* - were in fact, rather 'conventionally shot and edited' (1996 (a): 156) but later features such as *The Last of England* and *The Garden* shared elements of avant-garde and art cinema in 'an eclectic, hybrid manner' (O'Pray, 1996 (b): 178).⁴⁵ It is this eclectic and unique blending of the avant-garde with art cinema that is central to one's understanding of Jarman as a filmmaker. Certain aspects of Jarman's films, such as their 'lack of professional sheen', have made them 'difficult to appreciate within the conventional terms of art cinema criticism' (1996 (a): 185). While Jarman was an avowed enthusiast of European art cinema, who wanted to follow in the footsteps of filmmakers such as Pasolini and Fellini,⁴⁶ this technical rawness one can detect in Jarman's feature films, with the possible exception of *Caravaggio* and *Edward II*, is more characteristic of avant-garde filmmakers such as Kenneth Anger and Andy Warhol. Like these American 'underground' filmmakers, Jarman 'had no desire to become permanently part of the industrial system of production which characterises commercial cinema' (Wymer, 2005: 25) and he saw their work as a key inspiration that was 'close to something one could actually do oneself [and which demonstrated] that it didn't matter if you didn't adhere to all the technicalities and rules' (Hacker and Price, 1991: 249).⁴⁷ Jarman's own major transgression from the technicalities and

⁴⁵ *The Garden* perhaps represents Jarman's most complex hybrid of avant-garde and art cinema sensibilities. The film combines the seemingly random and dream-like 'journey without direction' of an 'I-movie' with a retelling of Christ's Passion that gives the films a strong and indeed well known central narrative. The Passion narratives also links the film explicitly with European art cinema as Jarman frequently referred to the film as his version of Pasolini's *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Peake, 1999: 467).

⁴⁶ See Jarman (1984: 234) Wymer (2005: 22).

⁴⁷ Jarman's attitude to Warhol was somewhat ambivalent however, and he had great reservations about his work, calling Warhol 'a truly dead mirror' (Jarman, 1987: 76). See also O'Pray (1996 (a): 185) and Wymer (2005: 3).

rules of mainstream cinema came in his adoption of Super-8 cameras for making feature films.⁴⁸

Super-8, a user-friendly updating of standard 8mm film cameras, 'was normally employed at the time by amateur filmmakers to make 'home movies'' (Wymer, 2005: 25), however, avant-garde filmmakers often prefer such amateur equipment as it offers a certain amount of financial and aesthetic liberty.⁴⁹ This was certainly the case for Jarman. For example, were one to compare Jarman's work on 35mm, the standard format of industrial cinema, and his films shot on Super-8, particularly *The Last of England*, one would note the formal restrictions of 35mm. The size and weight of a 35mm camera, for example, make it difficult, if not impossible, to use handheld, and therefore camera movements are limited to conventional types such as tracks, pans and tilts. Anything more complicated would take a great deal of time and indeed, money, to get right. On the other hand, the light, hand-held Nizo Super-8 camera favoured by Jarman allowed an ease of movement that is utterly at odds with the formality of 35mm.⁵⁰ Therefore, the visual aesthetic and mis-en-scène of Jarman's films shot entirely in 35mm - *Caravaggio* and *Edward II* - are comprised of predominantly static shots that reflect the painterly and theatrical subjects of the films, whereas the camera work in *The Last of England*, is constantly moving, often with a speed uncommon in mainstream feature filmmaking. One could argue that the specific attributes of the Super-8 format dictated much of the form and content of *The Last of England*. The low cost of the cameras made it possible for

⁴⁸ Marc Balet, an American student visiting London in 1972, introduced Jarman to the super-8 camera. See Wymer (2005: 25).

⁴⁹ Stan Brakhage, for example, defended the 'amateur' filmmaker against critics, stating that he proudly aligns his work with that of the maker of home movies rather than 'professional' filmmakers, as 'an amateur works according to his own necessity [which is] surely more personally meaningful than work only accomplished for money, or fame, power, etc.... and *most* assuredly more individually meaningful than commercial employment' (Brakhage, 2001: 144; his emphasis).

Jarman and his assistants⁵¹ all to be operating cameras simultaneously and spontaneously, thus recording scenes from a variety of different angles and perspectives without having recourse to retakes or new camera set-ups. Furthermore, as the equipment was privately owned, and not rented at great cost, Jarman was at liberty to film without a detailed shooting script. Rather, 'he began to accumulate super-8 footage taken at various locations which could later be edited into a significant structure' (Wymer, 2005: 111).⁵²

Wymer argues that *The Last of England* marked a return for Jarman to the 'less formal Super-8 films' (2005: 111) he had made before *Caravaggio*,⁵³ but 'this time augmented by editing techniques derived from his work on music videos derived with John Maybury, Richard Heslop and James Mackay' (2005: 111). Nowhere is this more apparent than in the 'Disco' sequence of the film which features no less than 1,600 cuts in only six minutes of finished film, making it one of the fastest and most aggressive montages in cinema. As Jarman himself wrote, this sudden uptake in the speed of the editing 'crashes into the film unexpectedly, the pace is relentless [and] should wind the audience' (Jarman, 1987: 14). While the sequence is indeed intended as a shock to the audience's senses, it is also born out of a need to experiment with new technologies and vocabularies in cinema, including the newfound ability to edit onto video. Such rapid editing, Jarman noted, would have been almost impossible to achieve through the conventional cutting and splicing of film (Jarman, 1987: 12-14).⁵⁴

⁵⁰ See O'Pray (1996 (d): 70) and Wymer (2005: 25-34).

⁵¹ These included Christopher Hughes, Cerith Wynn Evans and Richard Heslop.

⁵² According to O'Pray, the film 'comprises disparate footage, some shot with other ideas in mind, other parts improvised, others planned, and some of the camera work done by other artists' (O'Pray, 1996 (d): 72).

⁵³ See Jarman (1987: 143-45); O'Pray 1996 (a): 60-72; 122-43) and (1996 (d) 65-75); and Wymer (2005: 19-35; 83-91).

⁵⁴ Jarman noted that it was still a long and laborious process on video as the new technology demanded that the footage be edited in sequence, but it had the added benefit of time coding, which allowed him to know with frame by frame accuracy, where he was in a reel of film. See Jarman (1987: 12-14).

While the sequence is by his own admission, ‘cut like a pop promo’ (Jarman, 1987: 12), Jarman’s relationship with the music video is a strange and ambivalent one.⁵⁵ While, on one hand he thought that the music video was ‘the only extension of cinematic language’ in the 1980s, he also thought that ‘it has been used for quick effect, and it’s often showy but shallow’ (Jarman, 1987: 12). Regardless of Jarman’s misgivings about music videos, his work with Marianne Faithful and The Smiths, *Broken English* (1979) and *The Queen is Dead* (1986) respectively, are both credited as ‘A Film by Derek Jarman’, and indeed deserve to be viewed as such. In terms of the limits of the genre, both are epic works, lasting in excess of fifteen minutes and featuring three-song medleys by each of the artists. Additionally, Jarman’s preference for Super-8 (and later video) proved to be ideally suited to making music videos, for not only was it cheap, amazingly mobile and easy to edit, Super-8, through its lack of direct, synchronised sound, offered a purely imagistic counterpoint to the words and music. Perhaps most radically however, Jarman’s short films represent one of the first collaborations on a music video where the filmmaker was allowed to accompany the music with the visuals of his choice, rather than merely showing the band either in performance or larking about, as in the early pop promos produced by The Beatles and others in the late 1960s. For Jarman, these videos were a means of paying the rent, especially during the industrial feature film hiatus between *The Tempest* and *Caravaggio*. However, some of the footage for *The Queen is Dead* was even carried over into the final cut of *The Last of England*, cementing the relationship between this

⁵⁵ Jarman’s influence on the music video ironically come less from the videos he directed than from his films. For example, can be seen in such works as Tarsam’s video for R.E.M.’s ‘Losing My Religion’ ‘which makes direct references to *Caravaggio* and less direct allusions to *Sebastian*’ (Wymer, 2005: 2), and Gus Van Sant has noted the influence of *The Last of England* on the music videos for The Red Hot Chili Peppers. See Van Sant (1993: 89-99).

fledgling form of film art and the older tradition of the avant-garde.⁵⁶

The Garden forms something of a companion piece with *The Last of England*,⁵⁷ not least in their similar structures, which borrow from several of the great avant-garde films of the post-war years. Tony Rayns argues that these two features are in fact examples of ‘trance films’ or ‘I-movies’⁵⁸: a form of psycho-drama established in such avant-garde films as Deren’s *Meshes in the Afternoon* (1942) and Anger’s *Fireworks* (1947),⁵⁹ in which, ‘the filmmaker himself plays out a drama of psychological revelation; it is cast in the form of a dream beginning and ending with images of its hero as a sleeper’ (Sitney, 2002: 87).⁶⁰

Jarman indeed places himself at the beginning of both these films and can be seen to ‘dream’ the action that follows.⁶¹ However, his role in *The Last of England* is somewhat peripheral. At the start of the film, Jarman is seen at his desk working on a painting and reading from his notebooks, and the film, in a manner typical of the trance film takes the form of the director’s vision or dream. However, outside of the inclusion of some early home movie footage shot by his father, Jarman plays little part in the proceedings of the film. Nor, as Annette Kuhn has noted, is the film as personal as it at first seems⁶²; the central relationship in the film is in fact a heterosexual one, between a man (Spencer Leigh) executed by the soldiers who terrorise the film’s desolate landscape and his bride (Tilda Swinton), who ends the films mutilating her wedding dress in a violent *danse macabre*. Indeed, it is tempting in the case of *The*

⁵⁶ See Wymer (2005: 31).

⁵⁷ Tony Rayns’ review in *Time Out* began: ‘[a]t first this looks like *Last of England 2*’ (2002: 429)

⁵⁸ Rayns derives the term from the Japanese ‘I-novel’.

⁵⁹ See also Sitney (2002: 18).

⁶⁰ Sitney and Rayns note that Cocteau’s *The Blood of a Poet* (1930), while not a trance-film itself, is ‘the model for its development’ (Sitney, 2002: 18).

⁶¹ According to Sitney the ‘quest figure’ in a trance film is ‘either a dreamer or in a mad or visionary state’ (2002: 131). In the case of *The Last of England* Jarman would seem to be the latter. See (O’Pray, 1996 (d) 73).

⁶² See also Kuhn (1995: 109).

Last of England to infer that the trance film structure was added retrospectively, like Shakespeare's sonnets in *The Angelic Conversation*, as a belated means of imposing structure on an otherwise 'improvised film' (Jarman, 1987: 163).

However, as Rayns writes, Jarman is 'squarely at the centre' of *The Garden* (Rayns, 1990: unnumbered). As in *The Last of England*, Jarman begins the film at his desk, surrounded by Christian imagery, but this time he is asleep, 'clearly dreaming the film into being' (Rayns, 1990: unnumbered). The resulting 'vision' is far more personal. The retelling of Christ's Passion which Jarman dreams is explicitly homoerotic, with Christ refigured as two gay men. The two lovers at once recall their counterparts in *The Angelic Conversation* in their appearance and tenderness with one another; however, the persecution they endure at the hands of policemen and other authority figures brings them closer to the tragic figures of Edward and Gaveston in Jarman's next film, *Edward II*. Furthermore, the film was shot in and around Jarman's cottage at Dungeness and 'the garden' of the title is Jarman's own.

Jarman himself is also a recurring 'structural presence' (Petrie, 1990: unnumbered) in the film. In one particularly memorable sequence, Jarman is laid in his bed on the beach, surrounded by men and women, naked from the waist up, who carry torches and circle him. This sequence at once implies that the filmmaker is still dreaming the events of the film, but takes on further significance as the voice-over speaks of AIDS, death and the filmmaker's own mortality. The bed is then Jarman's own deathbed and the circling figures with their burning torches give the scene the ritualistic quality of a funeral vigil. *The Garden* was indeed Jarman's first explicit meditation on AIDS and his own HIV Positive status.⁶³

⁶³ More oblique references to his HIV Positive status and the AIDS crisis appear in the earlier *War Requiem*, however. See Wymer (2005: 125).

O'Pray notes that *The Last of England* and *The Garden* were two of three films 'made in the last seven years of his life [...] which contain his own public and private self' (1996 (a): 155). The third and final of these films, *Blue* (1993), was also Jarman's last and ironically his most experimental, idiosyncratic and avant-garde. Visually, the film comprises of nothing more than an unchanging blue matt screen, over which Jarman and his friends and colleagues Nigel Terry, John Quentin and Tilda Swinton read excerpts from Jarman's diaries that poetically trace his struggle with AIDS, his increasing blindness, the loss of friends and loved ones to the disease and his own impending death. This divorce from the image seems at first very uncharacteristic of Jarman, who following *Caravaggio*, had been nominated for the Turner prize, "in recognition of the outstanding visual qualities of his films" (Peake, 1999: 371)⁶⁴ and who on so many occasions spoke out against the crippling reliance of the British cinema on the written word.⁶⁵

Blue actually began life as a proposed project about the painter Yves Klein, whose monochrome paintings Jarman greatly admired.⁶⁶ These works were often contemplations of pure blue; painted in International Klein Blue (IKB), a shade of Klein's own invention.⁶⁷ While this unrealised project perhaps sounds closer in tone and in spirit to *Caravaggio*, in its celebration and dramatisation of the life of a painter, in actuality 'Jarman hoped his homage to Klein might take the form of an imageless screen in IKB, complemented only by a "sophisticated Dolby stereo soundtrack which would tell the Yves Klein story in sound and jazzy be-bop"' (Peake, 1999: 399). However, as Jarman's health and especially his sight deteriorated, the project began to

⁶⁴ The nomination listed *Sebastiane*, *Jubilee*, *The Tempest* and *Caravaggio*. See Peake (1999: 557). See also O'Pray (1996 (a): 172-3).

⁶⁵ Jarman's most sustained attack on this tendency in British cinema is in *Queer Edward II*, the published screenplay of his adaptation of Marlowe's play. See Jarman (1991).

⁶⁶ See Wollen, (2000: 120-33).

evolve into something at once far more personal and universal. On one level, Jarman's failing sight did indeed help to dictate the form *Blue* finally took, as he lacked both the stamina and the eyesight to shoot another film in the conventional manner. More importantly, the format of *Blue* provided Jarman with a solution to the problems of effectively representing the nature of AIDS on film. As Jarman wrote: '[n]o ninety minutes could deal with the eight years HIV takes to get its host. Hollywood can only sentimentalise it [...] the reality would drive the audience out of the cinema and no one viewpoint could mirror the 10,000 lives lost in San Francisco to date' (Jarman, 2000: 290). For Jarman, AIDS was rightly not a subject for entertainment and he thought that to depict the 'progress' of AIDS through characters, narrative and even images would immediately cheapen and debase it.⁶⁸ Therefore, '*Blue*'s rejection of artifice is an aesthetic decision inspired by specific political and ethical criteria' (Porton, 1996: 140).

The blue screen intended for the Klein film then provided the answer to both of Jarman's problems of failing sight and an appropriate visual representation of the disease. If the film is visually simple, the soundtrack however, involving music and a sound design by Simon Fisher Turner and the poetic voiceovers of Jarman, Terry, Quentin and Swinton, is highly complex. And for the film to succeed, it had to be, for in *Blue* the soundtrack at once has to provide the film's narrative, its pictures and its emotional core without the complement of traditional film images.⁶⁹ However, the diary entries read by the cast are both visually evocative and at times almost unbearably moving. Furthermore, perhaps spurred on by his previous film.

⁶⁷ See Alison (2001).

⁶⁸ Jarman's film, as Gabriele Griffin has noted, was released at the time when 'HIV/AIDS was at the height of its public visibility' and several notable films were released on the subject between 1992 and 1993, including: Cyril Collard's *Savage Nights* (1992), Gregg Araki's *The Living End* (1992) and Jonathan Demme's *Philadelphia* (1993). See also Wymer (2005: 173).

Wittgenstein, Jarman also plays an elaborate language game with the word 'blue', covering almost every conceivable connotation one can think of with the colour: blue movie, blue screen, the blues, the sea, the sky, a void, an abyss and so on.⁷⁰

Blue was an unusual film in more ways than one. It was the first film to be shown on Channel Four without breaking for commercials and was also the first film to be simultaneously broadcast on television and the radio.⁷¹ Perhaps the most notable and ironic thing about *Blue* however, is just how accessible it is. Wymer illustrates this with an apt comparison between *Blue* and its 'most famous cinematic predecessor' (2005: 173) Guy Debord's *Hurléments en faveur de Sade* (1952). Rarely seen,⁷² Debord's first film consists of an hour's worth of silent, imageless black screen, at times violently interrupted by periods of imageless white screen 'with added voice-overs largely made up of quotations' (Rees, 1999: 63). The film, as Wymer notes, was 'not intended to give pleasure to its audience. It was [rather] intended to provoke them into a baffled fury' (2005: 173-4). *Blue* however, 'instead of alienating its audience like Debord's film [...] seduces them, drawing them into an experience which is both shared with Jarman and remains highly individual' (Wymer, 2005: 174). If a film such as *Caravaggio* belongs to the 'public' sphere O'Pray notes in Jarman's work, and a film like *The Angelic Conversation* to the private; *Blue* belongs to both.⁷³ Jarman's 'private' work, like that of many other avant-garde filmmakers, had always

⁶⁹ Bersani and Dutoit (1999: 50)

⁷⁰ See Jarman (1995) and Porton (1996: 135-60).

⁷¹ The sound track of *Blue* was broadcast on Radio 3 at the same time as the Channel Four screening. Radio listeners were invited to write in for a blue postcard, which they could contemplate at length during the programme. Unquestionably, *Blue* works extraordinarily well on the radio, and several of the film's critics, such as Leslie Halliwell, noted that it is perhaps best suited to this purely aural medium (Walker, 1999: 98). Other reviews, such as that in *The Sun*, were far more hostile, saying that 'It may be blue, but it's no movie' (*The Sun* 18/9/93). See also Peake (1999: 527) and Wymer (2005: 173-4).

⁷² *Hurléments en faveur de Sade* was the first of Debord's six films made between 1952 and 1978. Although they were rarely shown Debord withdrew them from circulation himself in 1984 in protest to the unsolved murder of the left-wing publisher Gerard Lebovici. See Rees (1999: 63).

run the risk of being so personal as to be inaccessible to a general audience. For example, Jarman's little seen hour-long Super-8 film, *In the Shadow of the Sun*, contains a very personal and idiosyncratic set of symbols, allusions and references drawn from John Dee, Jung and an obscure seventeenth-century alchemical text⁷⁴ that may mean little, or even nothing to a viewer.⁷⁵ *Blue*, however, by taking Jarman's own experiences of AIDS as its subject, manages to be personal and autobiographical but also taps into the consciousness of the viewer, who could not possibly be untouched by this global epidemic. Furthermore, 'each spectator's experience of *Blue* is wholly unique' (Wymer, 2005: 174). Like the filmmaking technique that shares its name, the blue screen becomes a blank canvas on to which each viewer, prompted by the soundtrack, can impose his own images, resulting in an open film text. For this reason, *Blue* 'is nothing less than a revolutionary cinematic achievement [...] The intense blue screen and evocative soundtrack have redefined the notion of what is possible in cinema' (Garner, 1996: 57), by allowing Jarman and his audience to 'collaborate' in making an infinite number of different films each 'filled with half-formed private associations and desires' (Wymer, 2005: 174).

As accessible as it may potentially be, it must be noted that *Blue* is something of an isolated experiment. While a fellow queer filmmaker and avowed admirer of Jarman such as Gus Van Sant may pay tribute to it in his film, *Gerry* (2002), by inserting several seconds of otherwise imageless blue screen,⁷⁶ *Blue* has not succeeded in directly influencing the mainstream - a key feature of the avant-garde. This is a trend A.L. Rees has detected across Jarman's and Greenaway's work and is one of the main reasons he finds it problematic to consider either of them as avant-garde (1999:

⁷³ See O'Pray (1996 (a): 155). See also (Peake, 1999: 330).

⁷⁴ See O'Pray (1996 (a): 76) and Wymer (2005: 29-35).

100-1).⁷⁷ In addition to this, Rees contrasts the ‘particular freshness and resonance’ (1999: 100-101) of their smaller scale work, such as *The Garden*, *Blue* and Greenaway’s documentaries on *Four American Composers* (1983), with the ‘bombastic, overblown weight’ of the 35mm features, which he sees as being aesthetically ‘chained rather than liberated by the preordained shooting strategies which they adopted’ (1999: 100).

In light of the criticisms levelled against Jarman, Greenaway and Potter by critics such as Rees and Field, and luminaries such as Brakhage, one must legitimately question each of their claims to belong to any real tradition of the avant-garde. Indeed, even in films such as *Thriller*, *The Garden* and *The Falls*, which had distinct ties with certain types of avant-garde filmmaking, the major ‘reference points were art cinema’ (O’Pray, 1996 (c): 184). It is more accurate then, to view them as figures working in commercial art cinema that incorporated a number of aspects of the avant-garde into their work in an overt, perhaps even unprecedented, manner. While it could be argued that this has resulted in an innovative and exciting cross-breed of film forms, it has often merely resulted in their work existing in a kind of artistic limbo, being too ‘text-driven’ (Rees, 1999: 100) and not visually or politically radical enough to be considered avant-garde, yet too experimental and idiosyncratic to find mainstream acceptance easily.

The most notable exceptions to this rule - *The Draughtsman’s Contract* and

⁷⁵ See Wymer (2005: 29-30).

⁷⁶ See Van Sant (1993: 88-98) and Wymer (2005: 2).

⁷⁷ Rees notes that unlike filmmakers such as David Hall, Peter Gidal and Kenneth Anger and structural filmmakers, who have all exerted a strong and noticeable influence on mainstream film and popular media such as television, ‘Jarman and Greenaway were pretty much *sui generis*. It is difficult to think of any mainstream or TV work which has been touched by their style and hand - other than the work they themselves have made for that media’ (1999: 101).

Orlando - both of which were commercially successful,⁷⁸ perhaps owed their 'crossover' potential to the fact that they both operate within the confines of a recognisable and popular genre - the English period costume drama.⁷⁹ *The Draughtsman's Contract* also compounds this with aspects of another genre, the murder mystery. While the inclusion of recognisable generic elements in no way guarantees that an art film will crossover to the mainstream and become successful, it does greatly increase an art film's commercial viability. For example, at the time of its release, *The Draughtsman's Contract* 'for many [...] simply represented an exciting seventeenth-century 'who dunnit?'' (Hacker and Price, 1991: 189), rather than an esoteric hybrid of art-cinema and the avant-garde. Indeed, as Hill notes, 'the growth of British art cinema not only involved a degree of convergence between the avant-garde and art cinema but between art cinema and genre cinema as well' (2000: 28). This, of course, is nothing new, and many prominent European directors of the 1960s and 1970s, such as Godard, Truffaut, Chabrol, Wenders and Fassbinder, to name but a few, drew on elements of Hollywood genre films in their work. Therefore, the fact that films such as Chris Petit's *Radio On* and Neil Jordan's *Angel* 'combined the generic conventions of the thriller [...] with the thematic and stylistic concerns of the European art film' (Hill, 2000: 28), places them firmly in the context of the latter. However, films such as Petit's and Jordan's were made with a self-conscious referentiality and a clear understanding that the influence of Hollywood is both inescapable and that the inclusion of a certain generic element in a film is commonplace in art cinema. As the next Chapter shall demonstrate, their films manage to build on the experiments of their European forbears by alternatively

⁷⁸ See Hacker and Price (1991: 189) and (Rich, 1992: 229).

⁷⁹ A fact, which Rees notes, takes them even further from the avant-garde (1999: 101).

pushing the generic qualities even further into the margin, and by imposing an unprecedented amount of art film themes and techniques onto what might otherwise be a conventional genre film.

Chapter Five: The Influence of Hollywood and European Art Films on British Art Cinema.

Hollywood's dominance of the global film industry is such that its influence is almost inescapable. The classic European art cinema in the 1960s and early 1970s, which cast itself as distinct from many of the attributes of mainstream cinema was still, of course, born out of an amalgamation of Classical Hollywood and the European modernist films of the inter-war years.¹ Even at its most radical, for example Godard's work in his 'Counter Cinema' phase of the late 1960s and 1970s,² art cinema is 'intensely interested' (O'Pray, 2004: 128) in the practices of Hollywood cinema, precisely because it seeks to define itself in opposition to it. British cinema however, with its common language and history of collaboration, has perhaps felt the influence of Hollywood more strongly than most.³ Indeed, as Street notes, 'it is more or less impossible to think of British cinema without reference to its relationship with Hollywood' (Street, 1997: 197). British art cinema is therefore located in a cultural borderland between the conventions of Hollywood cinema and the more experimental work of its neighbors in continental art cinema. Films such as *The Garden* and *The Gold Diggers*, which the previous Chapter argued were both hybrids of European style art films and the avant-garde, also betray, to varying degrees, the influence of mainstream Hollywood films. Jarman, for example, halts the narrative of *The Garden* to include a camp rendition of the song 'Think Pink' taken from Stanley Donen's Hollywood musical *Funny Face* (1956), and Potter's film both parodies and pays homage to Hollywood genres such as the musical, melodrama and *film noir* in order to

¹ See Truffaut (1998).

² See Wollen (1999 (b): 519-35).

³ See Murphy (1986: 47-71), Elsaesser (1993: 52-69) and Watson (2000: 80-7).

examine the role of women in film.

British art films are born out of a complex interrelationship between Hollywood and European art cinema, and if they cannot help but engage with the conventions of Hollywood cinema in some way, they can temper this influence with that of their European art cinema counterparts. For example, British art films, as this Chapter shall demonstrate, have simultaneously borrowed the form of Hollywood genres such as the thriller, *film noir* or the musical, and from the 'generic' attributes that characterise art films, such as fragmented narratives, ambiguity and alienated characters. Secondly, they have adopted the stylistic attributes of both kinds of cinema, from the narrative-driven techniques - such as continuity editing - of Hollywood to the self-conscious technical virtuosity and aestheticism of European art cinema. Finally, there is also the slightly different matter of financial investment. British art filmmakers have looked to both Hollywood, and to continental sources for patronage and financing for their films. This choice is often determined by a filmmaker's ambitions and generic and stylistic preferences. For example, a filmmaker such as Greenaway, whose films borrow a great deal more from the European rather than from Hollywood models, has chosen to avoid working in Hollywood in favour of courting investment from the continent. Potter however, whose work has always borrowed equally from both, has more recently sought an increasing amount of American investment for her films.

In this chapter I shall examine the complexity of this interrelationship between Hollywood and European art cinema, and their mutual effect on British art cinema by focusing on two acclaimed British art films, Chris Petit's *Radio On* (1979) and Neil Jordan's *Angel* (1982). These two film are particularly suited to this line of enquiry because they were each made with the support and guidance of older, established art

filmmakers - the German Wim Wenders and the American-based John Boorman - who acted as associated and executive producers on Petit's and Jordan's film respectively. This helped the films to secure funding, and gave their debutante directors some of the cultural significance and critical attention that came with their mentors' name. Both *Radio On* and *Angel* also reveal a strong, but far from crippling, debt to past genre films: in the case of *Radio On*, Mike Hodges' *Get Carter* (1971) and in the case of *Angel*, Boorman's seminal American crime film, *Point Blank*, starring Lee Marvin. While each film acts on one level as a thriller, they both, in different ways, subvert genre conventions through the use of generic and stylistic borrowings from art cinema. Finally, the subsequent careers of these filmmakers have taken opposite directions, with Petit favouring the aesthetics and patronage of European cinema and Jordan moving away from art cinema in favour of a more commercial career in Hollywood.

Radio On.

In many critical articles on *Radio On*, much is made of the film's debt to the films of Wim Wenders, and his celebrated road movies of the 1970s, *Alice in the Cities* (1974) and *Kings of the Road* (1976) in particular.⁴ However, Petit has argued that he turned to Wenders as a source of inspiration as 'British films had found themselves in a cul-de-sac' (Park, 1984: 112). He acknowledged his debt to Wenders - perhaps a little too enthusiastically - by not only in utilising Wenders' regulars Lisa Kreuzer, in a reprisal of her role in *Alice in the Cities*, and cameraman Martin

⁴ Park, for example, notes that Wenders' style is 'reflected in the film's abstract treatment of landscape, its use of rock music and the regressive nature of the central character' (1984: 122). See also Stoneman

Schäfer,⁵ but also by enlisting Wenders himself as associated producer,⁶ a fact that has led to some critics decrying the film as a mere copy. Such criticisms however, at once neglected the originality of the film by overestimating what Petit had derived from Wenders and underestimating the amount he openly derived from other films and filmmakers. Like Godard, Truffaut, Rohmer, Chabrol and indeed Wenders before him, Petit was a film critic - the film editor of the London based magazine *Time Out* - before becoming a filmmaker, and like these filmmakers Petit draws on his knowledge of world cinema in his films and equally displays the ability to recast old ideas in a way that is new and original. As Philip French noted in his review of the film in *The Observer*: '[i]t is a picture made by a cineaste for cinephiles, the work of a man with a real feeling for film' (1979: 17).

The film begins with a six-and-a-half minute hand-held point of view shot, shot in *noirish* monochrome by Schäfer, to the accompaniment of David Bowie's song 'Heroes', and his German version, 'Helden', which leads up a staircase to the interior of a flat, where a man lies dead in his bath tub. This virtuoso shot established not only the germ of the film's plot, but also sets its visual and aural qualities. Indeed, music plays an unusually central part in *Radio On* both on an off screen. Not only is the central character a DJ by profession, the film was also one of the first where the popular songs featured on the soundtrack played a large part in its marketing - now an almost common practice in selling a film. However, its use of music goes far beyond

and Thompson (1981: 19).

⁵ Schäfer began as the assistant to Wenders' regular cinematographer, Robby Müller, and worked as the second cinematographer on *Kings of the Road* and *Lightening over Water*, as well as on Petit's two features after *Radio On: An Unsuitable Job for a Woman* and *Flight to Berlin*. He died, aged forty-five, in 1988.

⁶ The film was a co-production between the British Film Institute and Wenders' Road Movies Filmproduktion', who put up half of the film's £80,000 budget in return for the German distribution and television rights (see Park, 1984: 144). In this way, the film was amongst the first British/European co-productions that would become commonplace for British art films over the next decades.

the mere inclusion of recent popular songs for commercial purposes. It stands rather alongside Kenneth Anger's *Scorpio Rising* (1964), Dennis Hopper's *Easy Rider* (1969), Martin Scorsese's *Mean Streets* (1973) and Wenders' own road movies in its use of contemporary rock music as an intelligent and often ironic counterpoint to the action of the film.⁷ Nowhere is this more apparent than in the use of 'Heroes/Helden'. The bilingual track, (seamlessly edited for the film), at once stresses the international nature of the production and the commercial necessity to appeal to the German market⁸, while also acting as an homage to the German films, particularly those of Wenders, that served as a source of inspiration. Furthermore, the choice of song, 'Heroes', provides a deeply ironic comment on the subsequent action of the film, as it not only introduces the viewer to the film's hero, Robert, but foreshadows the fact that he 'proves to be less than heroic' (Nowell-Smith, 1979: 30) by the standards of mainstream filmmaking, in ways detailed below.

Before returning to the dead man in the bathtub, (later revealed to be the protagonist's brother), the camera prowls through the flat. It energetically pans across the contents of a cluttered desk, and closes in on a handwritten quotation:

We are the children of Fritz Lang and Wernher von Braun. We are the link between the '20s and the '80s'. All change in society passes through a sympathetic collaboration with tape recorders, synthesisers and telephones
our reality is an electronic reality⁹

⁷ Petit notes that the ever-present music in the films is intended as 'part ironic comment, part palliative, part stimulant' (Petit, 1981: 20).

⁸ The song, which was recorded by Bowie in Berlin and makes explicit reference to the Berlin wall, was a hit in Germany, in both languages.

⁹ See Pym (1979: 233).

This quotation is the mission statement, if you will, for German electro-pop pioneers, Kraftwerk¹⁰ and serves not only to re-emphasise the central role of music in the film, but also its concerns with European art cinema and one of its key themes: alienation in the increasingly mechanised post-war world.

Stylistically, the film, with its shadowy images, long takes, virtuoso camera movements and stark black-and-white photography, recalls both the heyday of German expressionist cinema in the 1920s and 1930s, as typified by works such as Lang's *Mabuse* films and *M*, and the 'neo-modernist'¹¹ sensibilities of films such as Antonioni's *L'avventura*, Godard's *Alphaville* (1965) and Wenders' *Kings of the Road*. Furthermore, Petit's film shares with these latter works their enigmatic, ambiguous qualities. For instance, the opening sequence does not reveal where the film is set or who the man in the bathtub is, nor does it make it explicit that he is dead. Such ambiguities are continued throughout the film, which is full of unresolved narrative arcs and unanswered questions.

The opening shot is itself the first of many red herrings in the film, and establishes the finally unresolved thriller plot of the film. This point of view shot immediately recalls the opening POV shot of Michael Powell's career destroying *Peeping Tom*, in which the film obsessed protagonist, Mark, films himself murdering a prostitute with a hand-held 16mm camera, as well as innumerable POV shots that depict similar crimes in the films of Alfred Hitchcock and imitators such as Claude Chabrol and Brian de Palma.¹² And one could certainly be forgiven for thinking from

¹⁰ See Poschardt (2004, online). Available at:

<http://www.divus.cz/umelec/en/pages/umelec.php?id=334&roc=2004&cis=1>

¹¹ John Orr in *The Art and Politics of Film* to differentiate the European art films of the 1960s and 1970s from the first wave of modernist European films in the inter-war years coined the term 'neo-modernist'. See Orr (2000 (a): 1-19).

¹² See, for example, the extended point-of-view shot, and Hitchcock parody, at the start of De Palma's *Blow Out* (1981).

this opening shot that one is indeed watching a thriller.

This thriller narrative shift attention from Petit's borrowings from Wenders to another, less frequently noticed source of inspiration for the film, namely Mike Hodges' 1971 British underworld revenge drama, *Get Carter*, starring Michael Caine. Despite the fact that Petit had unquestionably seen Hodges' film - he had reviewed it for *Time Out* in 1971, praising it as 'one of the very few British films of the period to exploit its setting to its advantage' (Petit, 2002 (a): 436) - the majority of Petit's critics have overlooked the fact that the two films, at least at first, feature remarkably similar plots.¹³ Both films tell the story of a man leaving London to find answers about the mysterious death of his brother, who in both films was in some way involved in a local pornography ring.¹⁴ Ultimately, an examination of the way in which these two film utilise the same narrative arc can be very useful in illustrating the essential differences in the handling of plot, character, theme and even *mise-en-scène* between mainstream cinema in the Hollywood mould and art cinema.

On the most basic level, there is a certain difference in the way the films' stories are told. In *Get Carter*, Carter's journey from London occurs over the three-minute credit sequence, after which the action is located in Newcastle where he immediately begins to investigate his brother's death. However, as Terry Curtis-Fox has noted, Petit is not crafting a thriller, but rather, 'gives us hints of a thriller in the first five minutes [...] But, as in mid-career Godard, who is as important to Petit as Wenders, this melodramatic plot is merely an excuse' (Curtis-Fox, 1980: 25) around

¹³ Although almost no mention of the similarity between Petit's films and Hodges' were made upon *Radio On*'s initial release, Peter Bradshaw noted upon the BFI's 25th anniversary reissue of the film that it contained 'a weirdly transformed sense memory [...] of Mike Hodges' *Get Carter*. See (Bradshaw, 2004), available at: http://film.guardian.co.uk/News_Story/Critic_Review/Guardian_review_0..1321819,00.html

¹⁴ See Petit (1981: 20).

which to hang an examination of the director's themes.¹⁵ While Curtis-Fox is perhaps exaggerating when he claims that Petit disposes of all thriller elements in the film after five minutes, and they are in fact maintained for roughly half of the film's running time, he is correct in his assertion that in *Radio On* the journey to Bristol is the story, and the investigation into the brother's death is little more than a red herring; a plot device needed to provide a reason for the journey. However, this does not alter the fact that both Jack Carter and Robert B, the protagonists in the two films, begin their stories with exactly the same motivation and goal, and continue, or fail to continue, on that course in a manner typical of their respective cinematic milieus.

As was stated in the introduction to this thesis, characters from mainstream Hollywood cinema typically behave in a bold and decisive manner and their actions are dictated by their goals. Carter is precisely such a character. He begins the film determined to find out why his brother died and who was responsible. This done, his goal immediately changes to that of avenging his brother's death. The point at which his goal changes can be located at a precise moment in the film, when Carter, having just made love to Anna, the girlfriend of the local mob boss, watches a crude pornographic film, projected onto the bedroom wall, as she takes a bath. The film, *Teacher's Pet*, features a young girl being seduced by her female teacher, played by Anna, who then has sex with an older man. As he continues to watch, his amusement turns to disbelief and finally he seems to be silently crying as the camera cuts to a close-up of the young girl, who is Carter's niece. It is not long before Carter, who walks up to the bathroom and begins to curse and drown Anna, has deduced that his

¹⁵ Petit argues that '[s]een one way, *Radio On* functions as a traditional mystery story [...] [c]lues can be picked up during the unfolding of the 'plot', a journey between two English cities taken by the brother of the dead man, ostensibly to discover the cause of death. [However.] [w]ithin this framework the narrative operates on another level: as an examination of the hero/anti-hero in cinema at the end of the 1970s' (Petit, 1981: 20).

brother had seen the film and threatened to bring down the pornography ring responsible for it, before he was duly murdered. Carter's motivation, to discover the reason for his brother's death, which had always been strong, changes and becomes even stronger and well defined. He immediately starts on his brutal but ultimately self-destructive quest for revenge.

This scene in the bedroom is quoted directly in *Radio On*. In the relevant sequence Robert and his late brother's girlfriend watch a collection of slides, projected onto the bedroom wall, many of which feature images of hardcore pornography. An essential distinction can be found in the reactions and revelations experienced by the two male characters. Carter is outraged, and lashes out violently at Anna. Robert however, true to the form of a character from art cinema, is conspicuous in his passivity. These images neither disturb nor arouse him in any way. The scene in *Get Carter* is the moment of revelation in which Carter understands why his brother was killed. However, similar images in *Radio On* offer Robert no such revelations. They do not reveal, as he had hoped, the ultimate reason for his brother's death, and who might have killed him. He is not even given the comfort of knowing which side his brother was on in the local pornography war mentioned in several radio broadcasts during the film. Indeed, for all Robert knows, his brother was a pornographer, as the slides would seem to have belonged to him.

This passivity signals the essential difference between *Radio On* and *Get Carter*, and between the narrative and characters of the art film and the mainstream Hollywood thriller. In *Get Carter* this scene escalates the film into an even more violent and thrilling third act. In *Radio On* it paradoxically ends the thriller aspects, and indeed the entire plot of the film, and with them all character motivation Robert had. From this point on, Robert will begin to wonder aimlessly, unsure of where to go

and what to do. In this way, 'Petit has rejected the nineteenth-century novel's concern with motivation and character building [...] and created people whose histories and concerns are of little importance' (De Jongh, 1979: 13).

Petit does little, in conventional terms, to elicit sympathy or even interest in his protagonist, and Robert lacks both the motivation and careful characterisation of a character in quality mainstream cinema such as Jack Carter. Indeed, while Carter risked becoming one of the more amoral and repugnant protagonists in British cinema, a misogynist monster who kills both men and women without pity and remorse, he nevertheless managed to retain a certain amount of sympathy from the audience. Much of this was due to Caine's performance, which avoided the temptation common in genre films of the time that increasingly displayed the influence of European art cinema, of portraying Carter as either an existential loner, or a tragic hero. Rather, as Carter's reading of Raymond Chandler's *Farewell, My Lovely* during the train journey might indicate, Caine creates a more simple and old-fashioned character, who like Chandler's Philip Marlowe, is cynical, charming, pragmatic, and in possession of a playful sense of humour. This is particularly evident in the sequence where he momentarily forgets his business to watch two women fight over a man on the floor of a pub and joins the other spectators, both male and female, in a quick, rather juvenile laugh; an action that seems bizarrely incongruous when juxtaposed with the ferocious avenger he becomes in the film's second half. But the brilliance of Caine's characterisation comes from the fact that Carter is an identifiably ordinary working-class boy who just happens to be both a gangster and cold-blooded murderer. Carter has no time for introspection and angst, and the considerable sense of his alienation in the film comes not from within his character but from the world around him, that sees him as an anachronistic and

dangerous figure, more at home in the murderous world of the Krays and the Richardsons in 1960s London, than in the increasingly 'legitimate' gangland of the 1970s, where gangsters have wallets full of credit cards and own country estates.

Robert, on the other hand, does little that would enable an audience to identify or sympathise with him. He almost never laughs. He does enjoy a short, rather obscure joke with the garage attendant over the fact that the first policeman at the scene of Eddie Cochran's fatal car crash had the name Dave Dee - 'as in Dave Dee, Dozy, Beaky, Mick and Shit'¹⁶. Furthermore, Robert seems entirely disinterested in sex¹⁷. Perhaps strangely for a film that involves, however peripherally, a pornography ring, this is a condition he seems to share with the other characters in the film. His relationship with his girlfriend is entirely cold; there is no sense of intimacy between them, but rather a familiarity that has long since turned into contempt, and his leaving for Bristol marks the end of their relationship. The other three possible sexual encounters for Robert in the film: his dead brother's girlfriend, and the two German women, Ingrid (Kreuzer), who is searching for her daughter, and her friend, all come to nothing. His brother's girlfriend seems equally unaffected by the pornographic slides. The German friend, who does not speak English, according to Ingrid, 'hates men'. This last moment not only highlights the asexuality of Robert's world, but also the simple inability of people in it to communicate at all, as Robert tells Ingrid that there is no word in English for a woman who hates men, only one for a man who hates women. Thus, one of the few sincere attempts in the film to voice an emotion is hindered by the inadequacies of language. At this point it becomes apparent that the

¹⁶ The joke, which unsurprisingly relates to music, is at the expense of the asinine pop group Dave Dee, Dozy, Beaky, Mick and Titch. According to unpublished archival sources at the British Film Institute, this joke, one of the few in the film, was impossible for the film's German distributors to translate.

¹⁷ Carter, on the other hand, is shown to possess a prodigious sexual appetite: he not only sleeps with Anna, but is also shown to have an affair with his boss' girlfriend in London, and succeeds in seducing

most significant male-female relationship in the film, that which forms between Robert and Ingrid, will not be a satisfactory one, as within moments of meeting, the limits of communication between the two are established. Later in the film, Robert makes an inept attempt to seduce Ingrid by reading the German translations of 'I'd like a double room' and 'I will see you home' from her German to English phrase book only to have Ingrid tell him, just before their final parting, 'Last night I thought we would sleep together, but now I know we won't'. However, she is not talking about sex alone, but rather about the couple's inability to make any real connection, and while the pair are unquestionably drawn to one another, this is ultimately through a sense of mutual loneliness and despair, rather than any real attraction or compatibility.

Petit highlights this in one of the most celebrated shots of the film. After talking together for some time in a cheap hotel about their problems - Ingrid's missing daughter and Robert's own confusion - the camera cuts to an exterior shot of the Grosvenor hotel taken from the Victoria Street flyover Robert drove over to enter Bristol. Although the two are in the same room they are each framed in separate windows, looking down on the city in different directions, both seemingly unaware of the other's presence. It is an image of urban isolation worthy of Edward Hopper. However, the shot begs an important question that relates to the conventional grammar of cinema. While cutting to an exterior shot at this point is neither an unconventional nor a cinematically ungrammatical move, the fact that it is taken from a moving car implies that it is a shot taken from someone's perspective. But whose perspective it is remains ambiguous.

Whilst the most likely explanation is that it came from the perspective of the

his landlady in Newcastle.

director himself, who simply could not resist including the Hopperesque image on a formal and aesthetic level, and the film is indeed full of moments where ‘the movement of the camera [...] is the only attributable subject of the shot’ (Nowell-Smith, 1970: 30) - not least the virtuoso opening sequence, which too is ambiguous in its perspective - the actual identity of the person whose perspective it is, is ultimately unimportant. What is important however, is the purpose of the shot, which is at least two fold. On a strictly aesthetic level, this is part of what Chris Auty, Petit’s *Time Out* colleague has called Petit’s ‘rare almost eerie attempt at mythic British cinema’ (2002 (c): 950), which invests the cinematically underrepresented British landscape with the same awesome reverence that John Ford gave the Monument Valley. The A420 to Swindon may not at first seem the most likely of cinematic locations, but Petit and Schäfer manage to turn England - Camden, Britsol and the factories, motorways, railways lines and country-side in between - ‘into a landscape of the imagination’ (Pym, 1979: 234).

Additionally, this shot from the flyover serves to distance the viewer from what little action and human interaction is happening in the hotel room by implying its meaninglessness to any ‘viewer’ who happens to be passing at the time. To such a viewer, these characters would have no meaning and their individual stories no real significance. Petit’s *mise-en-scène* thus questions the very nature of the conventional cinematic experience, in which the viewer comes to identify and empathise with the characters on display. Rather, in the manner of Brecht, Petit keeps the viewer at an emotional distance from the characters. He almost entirely avoids close-ups and reaction shots, the cinematic techniques commonly used to build characters and forge emotional links with them.

For example, Robert is never seen to grieve for his brother in a conventional

way. Even Carter, in a rare moment of tenderness, places a white death shroud over his brother's face and is seen to cry. The closest Robert comes to this is when he studies a slide of a recent picture of his brother. After a while he approaches the wall and begins to touch the image of his brother's face, before curling up in the corner, next to the projection. The image of the two brothers facing each other in profile is not so much touching as bleak. Unlike Carter, who can touch the hands and face of his brother one last time, Robert is left with only a two-dimensional, electronically generated copy of his brother on the wall. Therefore, the viewer is less likely to find any emotion in this scene, but rather to contemplate, as the camera does, the striking resemblance between the two brothers. This leads the viewer to *think* about the implications of this image and of the brother's death. As Nowell-Smith notes, it is importantly not Robert's father who dies, but his brother (1979: 32), who is essentially a facsimile copy of him - just as the image of his brother on the wall is a facsimile of a once living being. Furthermore, the figure of the dead brother on the wall, who is visible but intangible and recognisable as a human form but incapable of human feelings, mirrors Robert's own internally dead state. 'In a sense', as Petit notes, '*Radio On* is about the absence of a protagonist' (1981: 20).

The sense of alienation in *Radio On* is almost total. The characters are alienated from society and each other, and the viewer is in turn alienated from the characters and the action. It is perhaps in this way that the film most obviously differs from the work of Wenders. While the majority of Wenders' films centre on the existential conflicts of lonely (mostly male) protagonists, who feel disillusioned with and alienated from society, his work, for all its austerity, still exudes a human warmth. and - as the narratives of many of his films illustrate - faith in the possibility of redemption and renewal through human relationships. For instance, the disillusioned

photographer in *Alice in the Cities* and Travis, the hero of *Paris, Texas* (1984), find a new sense of purpose and lease of life through their relationship with children: Alice, a nine-year-old stray and Travis' son respectively. Similarly, the two drifters in *Kings of the Road* forge a close but unspoken bond with one another before parting ways and Daniel, the melancholy angel in *Wings of Desire* (1987), is inspired by love to return to earth as a mortal. Indeed, by his own admission, Wenders is incapable of not sympathising with his characters¹⁸. This is particularly noticeable in *The American Friend*, his adaptation of Patricia Highsmith's novel *Ripley's Game*, in which he alters a thriller about the charming but malevolent Tom Ripley drawing an innocent family man into life as an underworld assassin into a touching story of redemption through friendship.

Petit's film however, presents a far bleaker picture of modern life. Certainly, the lone hero and his existential doubts are equally to the fore, as is a sense of disillusionment and alienation, but there is no possibility of redemption or transcendence. Rather, for Petit, they have infected the whole of society and have therefore become the inescapable condition of our time. Unquestionably, *Radio On* is one of the bleakest visions in British cinema and occupied a space far closer to the work of Antonioni than Wenders. Robert's quest for information about the death of his brother, like the search for Anna in *L'avventura*, despite being the (initial) purpose of the narrative, is ultimately abandoned well before the end of the film. However, one could argue that the sense of alienation in *Radio On* carries even further than it does in the work of Antonioni. While in the world of *L'avventura*, *Blow-Up*, and *Zabriskie Point*, the sense of angst cannot be escaped, one can fool oneself into thinking it can be alleviated, at least temporarily, through the hedonistic pursuit of

¹⁸ From the commentary track of *The American Friend* (2003, Anchor Bay Films).

pleasures such as sex and consumerism. However, as I have shown, there is not even the possibility of these vicarious thrills in Petit's universe.

The only escape and alleviation in *Radio On* comes in the form of music, which serves not only to emphasise Robert's alienation but also supplies 'the emotions [he is] no longer capable of feeling' (Canby, 1980: 49). This is notable in the scene in which the garage attendant, played by Sting in his film debut, sings Eddie Cochran's 'Three Steps to Heaven' to Robert at a petrol station only a few miles from the site of Cochran's fatal car crash in 1960. Here the song ironically alludes 'to a return to an age of innocence from which one can look forward to the future' (Nowell-Smith, 1979: 35). However, the contemporary songs on the soundtrack, such as Ian Dury's 'Sweet Gene Vincent', a punk/new wave tribute to another early Rock and Roll pioneer, are 'by contrast, devoid of illusion' (Nowell-Smith, 1979: 35). Robert's emotional need for music also inadvertently leads to the three hostile encounters Robert has in the film. In the second he is refused access to a club and exchanges (inaudible) words with the bouncer, in the first and the third he plays music on a pub jukebox and encounters dangerous and violent characters. Firstly, a Scottish army deserter, whose traumatic experiences in Northern Ireland and inarticulate rage cause Robert to abandon him by the side of the road, and finally the female pool-player in a bar, who late in the film attacks the impassive Robert as he accidentally causes her to foul a shot.

Robert's final contact with his dead brother is also musical, and comes in the form of a posted birthday present of three audiocassettes, all three albums by Kraftwerk. Robert continually plays these albums in his car, as if he were looking for answers to his brother's death through them. While this ultimately proves a fruitless exercise for both Robert, the music does provide the viewer with insight into Robert

himself. On a literal level, the use of Bowie's 'Heroes/Helden' at the beginning of the film and the inconclusive final scene in which Robert abandons his car and subsequently boards the first train going anywhere, which plays out to Kraftwerk's 'Ohm Sweet Ohm', indicate Robert's sense of dislocation; he is no hero and has no home to go back to. More importantly however, Kraftwerk produce music that can only be defined as 'electronic' or 'industrial' and is both performed on machines - computers and synthesisers - and thematically concerned with subjects such as nuclear power, computers, robotics, and corporate and cultural imperialism. Their music prefigures many of the concerns of Cyberpunk, and shares its sense of human alienation in an increasingly machine dominated world. This is emphasised in the quotation that features in the opening shot, which in referencing Fritz Lang alongside Wernher von Braun, tape recorders and synthesisers, highlights two central concerns of Petit's film: cinema, (and the German cinema of Lang and Wenders in particular), *and* the alienation and 'electronic reality' of the post-war mechanical age.¹⁹ While the former has often been discussed by critics of the film, the latter is also worthy of examination.²⁰ *Radio On* is full of images of machines and technology, which serve to disembody the film's human characters. This is particularly the case with Robert, whose primary action as a character is to operate and interact with machinery and technology: his car, its stereo, the record player he uses in his job as a disc jockey at a factory, the televisions in his apartment, the radio on which he hears of the pornography ring in which his brother was probably involved, the slide projector on which he watches some of his brother's pornographic material, and the jukeboxes in

¹⁹ The German rocket scientist who was the mastermind behind the V-1 and V-2 rockets and later a key figure in the American space race, working as a project leader on both the Mercury and Saturn programs for NASA. See Pizskiewisz (1998).

²⁰ In his brief review of the film in *Monthly Film Bulletin*, John Pym does make reference to the importance of technology in the film. (1979: 233-4).

the numerous pubs he visits on his journey. However, these machines - allegedly modern conveniences, designed to make life easier and more bearable - offer Robert no comfort. His car breaks down many times, and ultimately has to be abandoned in a quarry. The radio and the slide projector only help to confirm his suspicions that his brother's death was the result of both foul play and underhand dealings on his part. yet, like the audiocassettes, still offer no real solution as to why and how he died.

Ultimately, *Radio On* not only subverts the expectations and conventions of the thriller genre but also challenges most conventional notions of making and viewing film by attempting to make a film that only on the most superficial level acknowledges the role of plot, motivation and characterisation and thus risks both alienating and boring its audience. However, as Curtis-Fox notes: '[b]oredom is Petit's strategy' (1981: 25), and the purpose of his film seems to be to convey modern ennui.

Like the films of Resnais or Antonioni, *Radio On's* pleasures come from its visual and aural qualities - its camera work, memorable images, and the innovative use of music - and from its ideas - such as the examination of the alienating and dehumanising effects of the post-industrial age - rather than from the empathy or emotional engagement favoured by mainstream films. Furthermore, it makes only the most tenuous of borrowings from the generic forms of Hollywood cinema, and as a conventional thriller, *Radio On* is both underdeveloped and highly unsatisfactory. However, if Petit's film finally aligns itself squarely with the modernist European art films of the 1960s and 1970s and anticipates the work of British art filmmakers such as Greenaway, whose work displays a clearly continental sensibility and only the most tenuous relationship with Hollywood, the films of Neil Jordan demonstrate an altogether more complex blend of European art-house and Hollywood sensibilities.

The complexity of this relationship is nowhere more evident than it is in his debut feature, *Angel*, which represents a hybrid of conventional Hollywood genre material with the style and concerns of art cinema directors such as Buñuel, Antonioni and Fassbinder.

Angel

Jordan's film career, like that of Jarman, began by assisting an older British director, in this case, John Boorman, as script advisor on his Arthurian epic *Excalibur* (1981), which was shot near Jordan's home in Ireland.²¹ The meeting of the two proved fateful, as Boorman provided Jordan with the same support and patronage Wenders had offered Petit, and similarly served as executive producer on *Angel* - Jordan's debut. Indeed, the film offers a strong counterpoint to the discussion above of *Radio On*, as *Angel*, like Petit's film, borrows explicitly and openly from the work of its more famous producer. In the case of Jordan's film, the key intertextual reference is Boorman's American thriller, *Point Blank* (1967), one of the definitive Hollywood films of the 1960s,²² starring Lee Marvin. However, unlike Petit's borrowing of the plot of *Get Carter* merely for the beginning of his film, Jordan borrows both the plot and much of the distinctive editing style of his film from Boorman's source.²³

Unlike *Get Carter* however, whose strength lies mainly in its hard-boiled storytelling and Caine's affable performance, *Point Blank* is not typical of either

²¹ Previously, Jordan had been a writer and had found acclaim for his work *A Night in Tunisia* (1976), a volume of short stories, and his first novel, *The Past* (1979). See Rockett and Rockett (2003: 17-86).

²² See Petit (2002 (b): 910).

²³ While Boorman argues in the introduction to the published screenplay of *Angel*, that the film's 'style and structure (not its story context) were partly inspired by [...] *Point Blank*' (Jordan, 1988: viii), I will

Hollywood or the thriller genre, and in many ways come close to being an art film itself. Released in the same year as Arthur Penn's *Bonnie and Clyde*, at a time when European modernism was beginning to attract American studios, Boorman's film is notable for being one of the first films to successfully assimilate the influence and style of the French *nouvelle vague* into Hollywood.²⁴ Like *Bonnie and Clyde*, and indeed many of the films of the *nouvelle vague* before it, *Point Blank* uses American genre fiction as its basis, in this case a rather run-of-the-mill screenplay by Alexander Jacobs and David and Rafe Newhouse, based on the novel *The Hunter* by Richard Stark.²⁵

The plot of *Point Blank* sees Walker (Lee Marvin) shot and left to die by his Reece, his partner in crime and his wife's lover, in a cell of the now deserted Alcatraz, which the trio had been using as a hideout after a robbery. Walker survives however, and pursues Reece, his wife and his share of the money. After he locates his wife - whom Reece has abandoned and who subsequently commits suicide - and then Reece (whom he kills), but not the \$93,000 owed to him from the robbery, Walker goes after the leading members of the 'Organisation' Reece worked for. Aided by a mysterious figure, Yost, whom Walker and the viewer assume to be a policeman, he is guided, with unflinching accuracy, to each successive target, none of whom however, give him his money. Finally, after having (indirectly) killed many of the high ranking officials in the 'organisation',²⁶ Walker finds out the truth about Yost, who is actually 'Fairfax', the final member of the 'Organisation' who has Walker's money and offers

argue that the film's do feature similar narratives.

²⁴ Petit, reviewing the film for *Time Out* argued that while critics 'have noted the influence of Resnais behind the film's time lapses and possible dream setting, Godard's *Alphaville* offers a more rewarding comparison. Both films use the gangster/thriller framework to explore the increasing depersonalisation of living in a mechanised urban world' (2002 (b): 910).

²⁵ Stark is a pseudonym for Donald E. Westlake.

²⁶ For all the violence Marvin commits in the film, he does not actually kill anyone; the victims are

him a partnership. Walker however, walks away.

If the plot is a rather straightforward tale of double cross and revenge, the manner in which it is told remains unlike anything in American genre cinema. Clearly bringing the influence of Godard and Resnais with him from the continent, Boorman constructs *Point Blank* around an extremely complex series of time jumps. Beginning violently, with the image of Marvin's body being knocked to the ground by bullets, the film then flashes back to the robbery and double-cross at Alcatraz in a pre-credit sequence, then forward to detail Walker's recovery and escape from the deserted prison and on to his quest for revenge. However, while the narrative from this point is relatively linear, as Walker works his way up the ladder of the 'Organisation'. Boorman never stops playing with the element of time in the film. Scenes are frequently intercut with flashbacks to previous scenes. Some are almost subliminal, such as the numerous repetitions of the film's opening shot, in which Walker is apparently killed. Others are intercut in such a way that the dialogue from one scene converses with that of an earlier scene. For example, in sequence late in the film, Brewster, one of the heads of the 'Organisation', repeatedly asks Walker, 'what do you want?'. His answers, 'I want my ninety-three grand' and 'I want my money' are provided by cutting to early scenes in the film in which Walker said the same things to different characters. However, the editing in the film is not a mere stylistic device, but serves to underline Walker's single-mindedness and the repetitive and brutal nature of his quest for his money. Indeed, many of the scenes repeated in the film are ones that show the violent and destructive nature of Walker's character.

In its detailed character study of a brutal and determined man at odds with both modern society and the new type of criminal underworld it has fostered, in which

rather killed by accident or by other members of the organisation.

accountants have come to replace hoodlums, *Point Blank* unquestionably prefigures *Get Carter*. However, Boorman's is a richer and more complex film. *Point Blank* can solicit many readings from its viewer, not least the view that Walker was in fact killed on Alcatraz and the remaining narrative of the film is nothing more than the last, wishful vision of a betrayed and dying man. This reading is supported both aurally and visually throughout the film: in the dream-like structure, the recurring flashbacks to Reece shooting Walker, the finale, back at Alcatraz, where Walker does not collect his money but rather seems to fade away into the distance, and the recurring theme in the dialogue, which features lines such as, 'I'm looking at a dead man' and 'Walker, you really did die on Alcatraz'.

One must at this point address one of the central ironies of world cinema. Although art cinema characterises itself as running counter to the dominant trends of Hollywood, as outlined in the introduction to this thesis, the two opposing schools of cinema continuously borrow from one another.²⁷ For example, the style of American *film noir* that flourished in the 1940s and 1950s,²⁸ and had such a profound influence on the French *nouvelle vague*,²⁹ was, as the name may suggest, a European development, directly influenced by both German Expressionism³⁰ and French films of the late 1930s such as Michel Carné's *Quai des Brumes* (1938) and *Le Jour Se Lève* (1939), Julien Duvivier's *Pépé le Moko* (1937), and Jean Renoir's *La Bête Humaine* (1938), all starring Jean Gabin as the doomed hero.³¹ Likewise, an American genre film such as *Point Blank* can absorb the influence of even the most experimental and modernist aspects of European art cinema and still influence a far more

²⁷ See Neale (1981: 44) and Orr (2000 (a): 1-19).

²⁸ See Silver and Ursini (2004).

²⁹ See Truffaut (1998).

³⁰ See Eisner (1974); Robinson (1997) and Kracauer (2004).

³¹ See Rayns (2002 (d): 941).

straightforward mainstream genre film such as *Get Carter*. *Angel* however, is a particularly fascinating case, as it is derived from one of the most self-consciously modernist American films and combines this influence with that of the undiluted European modernism of Antonioni and Godard.

The reception of *Angel* in its native Ireland was almost universally hostile, and the attacks seemed to come from every conceivable angle. The film was at once criticised for being too American in its reliance on Boorman's source and other American films such as Martin Scorsese's *Taxi Driver* (1976), and for being too self-consciously 'arty' and European (Falsetto, 1999: 160-4). These criticisms are not unfounded. Jordan's film is more indebted to *Point Blank* than *Radio On* is to *Get Carter*, and Jordan, who has always been more conventional in his practice of genre cinema than Petit, does not at any point dispense with the thriller plot or mechanisms of his film. This said, *Angel* equally invites the contrary criticism that it is too arty. The film is full of explicit references to Antonioni and Luis Buñuel that many would find pretentious and intentionally obscure. Furthermore, Mario Falsetto notes that 'the film [...] recalls the unsentimental art film sensibilities of such European filmmakers as Fassbinder and Wenders' (Falsetto, 1999: 155).

Jordan's quest to balance these two opposing yet interrelated types of cinema in *Angel* is cleverly and subtly alluded to in one shot of the film, in which Danny, the film's protagonist, talks in a dressing room with his band's singer and new manager. In the *mise-en-scène* of the shot, Danny, who is facing the camera, is framed by two images from cinema history. To his left, reflected in the mirror behind him, is a poster of Richard T. Heffron's American film *Outlaw Blues* (1977), starring Peter Fonda as an ex-convict who becomes a Country and Western star, and to his right, tacked to the mirror, is a postcard of Antonioni's *L'avventura*, which at one point

Danny picks up and asks, 'who's Monica Vitti?'. This shot, without drawing too much attention to itself, offers the attentive viewer a way of viewing the film, as one that exists, as the Irish cinema itself does, at a midpoint between American and European film industries. Danny is at once part Walker and Travis Bickle and part Thomas from *Blow-Up* and Lemmy Caution from *Alphaville*.

For the film's supporters, the success of *Angel* rests in the skilful blending of art house concerns with genre elements. The plot of *Angel* centres on Danny (played by Stephen Rea, Jordan's favourite actor),³² the saxophonist with a up-and-coming band in southern Ireland. Referred to by some as 'the Stan Getz of South Armagh', Danny is however, a character plagued by questions and self-doubt, even about his genuine gifts as a musician. In the opening scenes of the film, Danny, practising outside of the 'Dreamland' ballroom, the club owned by the band's manager, Ray, is watched obsessively by a young mute girl. During that night's gig, Ray removes some troublesome thugs asking for protection money, Danny dances with the mute girl and his burgeoning relationship with the band's singer, Annie, is established. Afterwards, the mute girl follows Danny. The two then have sex in a construction site across from the club as Ray waits outside for Danny to show up. In this time the troublesome men from earlier that evening have returned, armed and wearing masks. The men confront Ray about his protection payments and execute him as Danny watches from across the parking lot. The mute girl, unsure as to what is going on, crosses the lot, and is in turn shot down by one of the men carrying a sub-machine gun. Moments later the men drive away and the club explodes. Danny is injured in the blast. In hospital, Bloom, a police inspector, and his subordinate, Bonner, ask Danny to try to identify the gunmen.

It is here in particular that the similarities to *Point Blank* begin. As Danny literally trades in his saxophone for a gun and hunts down the killers one at a time, the character of Bloom, like Yost in *Point Blank*, provides Danny with the information he needs to find each successive gunman. However, as a filmmaker, Jordan is at his best when he is able to exploit his generic material to its full effect while simultaneously undermining it with his own sense of irony and playfulness. *Angel* manages this difficult balance effectively, using the narrative arc of Danny's quest for revenge, like Walker's search for his money, to build up considerable narrative momentum and tension, as one would expect in a thriller. Jordan then undermines these generic elements by introducing into the script a series of puns, which would usually be more at home in one of his novels, quirky digressions such as Danny's Aunt reading tea leaves and Danny's conversation with another brass musician, now in a Salvation Army band, who has 'played for them all but now plays for the lord', and character ticks, particularly in the case of Danny. For example, the viewer is left to question who the 'angel' of the title really is. While it could be the mute girl, it just as likely could be Danny, the avenging angel. Indeed, as in *Point Blank*, Jordan playfully alludes to the fact that his protagonist may dream the narrative before dying as a result of the explosion. The club that is the site of the killings is, after all, called 'Dreamland'; Danny's Aunt May sees the 'nobodaddy' in Danny's tarot, which she states means death and Annie says that after his return from hospital Danny 'plays like an angel'.

Ultimately however, the central character in *Angel*, like Robert B. in *Radio On*, marks Jordan's most significant departure from his thriller source. This is especially evident in the witty scene where Danny finds an Uzi in the house of the first

³² See Falsetto (1999: 164-5).

gunman, and tries to feed the magazine into it backwards, a mistake hardly typical of the resourceful Hollywood action hero. Furthermore, the actor Stephen Rea is a tall but awkward figure, with a definite hangdog charm, but he lacks the steel-eyed charisma and imperviousness of Lee Marvin. This of course is one of the points of the film. Danny is no killer; he is not even a criminal. Rather, he is an ordinary man who like so many others in his country, has been driven to violence by anger, frustration and circumstance. This fact was overlooked by many of the film's Irish critics who took the film to be either apolitical or too cryptic in its depiction of The Troubles. *Angel* however, by avoiding an explicit depiction of it – the killing of Ray at the start of the film is defiantly not a sectarian killing, but a matter of business – offers one of the most successful depictions of The Troubles, in a manner that is allegorical but never cryptic.

The Troubles are forever present, only in the background. Graffiti announces the presence of the IRA. Danny, a Catholic keeps asking women if they were educated in convents and if they believe in sin. One girl tells her lover, one of the gunmen, 'you don't believe in sin, you're a prod'. Religion is an omnipresent and malevolent force in Jordan's world. Even the boy with the alleged healing powers is dressed in a flashy green suit, similar to the pink ones worn by the band, and is therefore relegated to the status of a showman and fraud, more there to exploit and entertain the people than to heal their spiritual wounds. Bloom, while an essential mechanism in the plot, is also however a neutral figure whom Danny can trust, for as a Jew he is non-partisan in the struggle. The name Bloom is almost certainly chosen as a tribute to the character in James Joyce's *Ulysses*, a cultural figure who tends to transcend sectarian boundaries and is viewed simply as Irish. The same can be said about 'Danny Boy', which Annie at one point tells Danny is 'his' song, to which he

replies, 'it's not my song, it's everybody's'.

By distancing himself somewhat from Irish politics, Jordan also avoids the pitfalls that films explicitly about The Troubles, such as Pat O'Connor's *Cal* (1984) and Terry George's *Some Mother's Son* (1996), fall into. These, to varying degrees, take sides in the conflict, and have tended to trivialise, over-dramatise and oversimplify a very complex matter. For Jordan, killing has taken the place of drinking and gambling as the Irishman's disease, and each killing motivates another killing and creates another killer, a fact clearly realised by the number of women in the film whose men are conspicuously absent.

At the close of the film, Bonner, Bloom's subordinate, who like Yost in *Point Blank* is revealed to be leading a double life as a policeman and as an underworld leader, says to Danny that a gun 'is easier to play than a saxophone. you only need to learn the one tune', and Danny, who has slid so easily into his new life, agrees. The idea of carting a sub-machine gun around in a saxophone case, and of speaking of 'playing' a gun the way one would an instrument, may be rather tired metaphors borrowed from Hollywood and American gangster mythology, which famously referred to the Tommy Gun as a 'Chicago Piano'. However, they serve Jordan's purpose in *Angel* admirably. Indeed, the word 'play' conjures up appropriate images of the violence the men hold to be so just and important, to be nothing more than a childish game, played by boys. The sense of the absurdity of killing is heightened at the close of the film, in which Danny, who at the beginning of the film cannot even load his Uzi properly, is seen to be carrying it casually by his side, no longer even in the saxophone case, as if it were an extension of his arm. However, any comparisons with Walker who holds his .44 in much the same way end there, as Danny is wearing his shiny pink band uniform, an allegedly 'glamorous' garment, which ironically

totally undermines any sense of glamour in the acts of violence he perpetrates.

The ending of the film, which takes place in the burnt out 'Dreamland' ballroom, echoes *Point Blank* with Bloom killing Bonner, and Danny walking away, while outside an unseen helicopter blows fliers advertising the boy with the healing powers across the parking lot where Ray and the girl were killed. The scene also recalls the finale of Buñuel's *The Exterminating Angel*, in its sense of desolation and entrapment. Like the socialites who cannot leave the church, but do not know why, Danny is not able to walk away from the killing, for as Bloom told him, evil is 'everywhere'. This final allusion to Buñuel consolidates the film's position as an art film rather than a conventional thriller. By Jordan's own admission, the narrative gaps in the film make it seem 'not finished at all' (Falsetto, 1999: 162), and it only makes 'gestures towards telling the story and the genre [...] for the purpose of getting certain themes and emotions on to the screen' (Falsetto, 1999: 162). But these narrative and generic 'deficiencies', as in *Radio On*, are ultimately one of the film's strengths, for the inconsistencies and digressions in the thriller plot direct the viewers' attention to the film's true purpose - namely, to study the 'attraction of violence, killing and nihilism' (Falsetto, 1999: 163), around which the thriller elements are a mere structuring device.

Funding British Art Films: Hollywood Versus Europe.

Despite the opinion of Jarman and others that both *Radio On* and *Angel* were two of the most significant first features in British cinema³³, which helped to establish the idea of a British art cinema, the subsequent careers of their makers have been

remarkably different. Jordan has gone on to have a successful, though inconsistent career in both Britain and Hollywood. Petit's work however, remains overlooked if not largely forgotten. This can be in part attributed to his choice of direction after *Radio On*. His second feature, *An Unsuitable Job for a Woman* (1982), based on the thriller by P.D. James, at first seemed 'to constitute a double crossover within British film culture', marking not only Petit's 'move from 'BFI production board backwaters into the commercial mainstream' but also 'his escaping of Wim Wenders and the art house by entering the generic world of the classic British detective story' (Jenkins, 1982: 93). However, the film was certainly more mainstream than *Radio On*. Petit's decision to make alterations to James' novel, including the imposing of a more ambiguous ending, led to rather awkward hybrid, which, according to Park, failed because it 'was neither sufficiently arty for the art house audience, nor accessible enough for mass audiences' (1984: 44). Petit then relocated to Germany.³⁴ While there he made two fascinating European co-productions, *Flight to Berlin* (1983) and *Chinese Boxes* (1984), which developed the art-house/thriller hybrid of *Radio On*.³⁵ Although these films seem to owe more to works such as Fritz Lang's *Mabuse* films, Godard's *Bande à Part* (1963), Fassbinder's *The American Soldier* (1970) as well as Petit's own idiosyncrasies, than they do to Wenders, they did little to dispel the criticism that Petit was a mere Wenders clone, nor did they provide him with a strong commercial base with which to continue making feature films. Ultimately, Petit's career as a feature filmmaker ended with *Chinese Boxes*,³⁶ and as he notes, '[f]or a

³³ See Jarman (1984: 234).

³⁴ See Petit, Combs and Jenkins (1984: 68-70).

³⁵ See Jenkins (1984: 67-8); Petit, Combs and Jenkins (1984: 68-70); Jenkins (1985: 135-6) and Combs (1985: 136-9).

³⁶ Subsequently, Petit's career has been confined to the realm of British television, where he has made three notable films in collaboration with Sinclair: *The Cardinal and the Corpse* (1992), *The Falconer* (1997) and *Asylum* (2000).

while I believed I would be able to interest a British producer in the idea of making European style films for £100,000 or less [...] but most of them wanted to look west first'³⁷

Indeed, while many British art filmmakers such as Jarman, Greenaway³⁸ and Leigh have echoed Petit's aversion to Hollywood and the idea of working there, with Leigh even going as far as to quip 'Given the choice of Hollywood or poking steel pins into my eyes, I prefer steel pins' (Walker, 2003: 284), the tendency for British producers and mainstream filmmakers to emulate Hollywood and seek to break the American market can still be found in British art cinema. The films of Nicolas Roeg, for example, were predominantly made with American money and have rarely been set in Britain. Indeed, many of Roeg's films often seem only nominally British, by virtue of his nationality and the fact that he has never, despite his American backing, become a Hollywood filmmaker in the way that Alan Parker and Ridley Scott have (Leach, 1993: 204). Subsequently, directors such as Davies and Potter have shown a similar tendency to Roeg and their more recent films, such as Davies' *The Neon Bible* (1995) and *The House of Mirth* (1999), and Potter's *The Man Who Cried* (2000) have seen them work in America, or with (some) American money and stars, while still maintaining independence from major Hollywood studios.

Jordan's case is more complex, however. With *Angel*, and its successor, *The Company of Wolves* (1984), Jordan began to establish a reputation as an *auteur* alongside filmmakers such as Greenaway and Jarman at the forefront of the growing contemporary art cinema in Britain. However, his third film, *Mona Lisa* (1986),

³⁷ BFI unpublished archives, *Radio On* Box 1, item 2.

³⁸ Greenaway is somewhat more ambivalent than Leigh and admits that *The Belly of an Architect*, which features an atypically linear narrative and stronger emphasis on character than his other works, and an Hollywood actor, Brian Dennehy, in its lead role, while still 'infinitely removed from a Hollywood tradition, [is] perhaps the closest [he has] ever gone in that direction' (Smith, 1997: 100).

while similar to *Angel* in its use of an underworld thriller plot to structure a complex character study, was however, by the director's own admission, far more conventional than his previous works (Falsetto, 1999: 168). The film eschewed the dreamlike structure of *Angel* and the outright fantasy of *The Company of Wolves* in favour of starkly realist Soho locations and traded the elliptical and episodic structures of its predecessors for a more conventional, linear narrative. Furthermore, *Mona Lisa* was Jordan's first film to cast bankable actors - Bob Hoskins and Michael Caine - in major roles.³⁹ Indeed, some critics took Jordan's confession to commercialisation further and called the film a "Hollywood ready" blend of slick visual style and fairly standard genre narrative [that] has the quality of an outstanding audition' (Fox and McDonagh, 1999: 527). Whether or not the film was made specifically with a move to Hollywood in mind, it was successful enough in America, doing more than respectable trade at the box office and earning Hoskins a 'Best Actor' nomination at the 'Oscars', to facilitate such a move (see Giles, 1997: 23).

Although his intention in going to Hollywood 'was to alternate higher budget studio movies with more personal projects' (Giles, 1997: 51), his first move to Hollywood was unhappy and short-lived.⁴⁰ His subsequent, successful, return there after the international phenomenon of *The Crying Game* (1992) - arguably his second 'audition', which became the 'most successful non-American film ever released in the USA' (Rockett, 1996: 93) - has for some signalled the death of Jordan as an *auteur*

³⁹ *The Company of Wolves* did feature some notable actors however, such as Terence Stamp and David Warner, but only in very small roles, and the film's narrator/Grandmother character was played by Angela Lansbury.

⁴⁰ Following the success of *Mona Lisa* (1986) his two Hollywood productions - *High Spirits* (1988) and *We're No Angels* (1989) - were marred by studio interference and poor critical and box-office reception. Jordan returned to Ireland in 1990 to make the overlooked *The Miracle*. See also Giles (1997: 23) and Falsetto (1999: 168-71).

and art house filmmaker.⁴¹ While some of his more personal projects, most notably *The Miracle* (1990) and *The Butcher Boy* (1997), both of which returned to Ireland for their locations and productions, seem to consolidate the *auteurist* reputation he began to develop with *Angel* and *The Company of Wolves*, this reputation is undermined by his tackling of more anonymous, commercial and generic Hollywood material such as *Interview with a Vampire* (1994) and *In Dreams* (1999).

Like that of Roeg before him, Jordan's career 'seems to confirm Alan Parker's claim that American financing is now required if a British filmmaker wants to make films with a more than modest budget' (Leach, 1993: 205), and while Jordan sees himself essentially as an independent filmmaker (Falsetto, 1999: 186) he sees a relationship with Hollywood as a practical necessity. For example, in order to fund such films as *Michael Collins* (1996), an ambitious project which became the most expensive film yet made in Ireland, it was necessary to secure the backing of a major Hollywood producer - David Geffen - and studio - Warner Brothers, and cast a major Hollywood star - Julia Roberts - in a pivotal role. Indeed, the multi-million pound budget was far beyond the reach of British cinema, where, after financial disasters such as Hugh Hudson's *Revolution* (1985) and Roland Joffe's *The Mission* (1986) producers remain reluctant to put so vast an amount of money into a single film. Jordan's decision to work in Hollywood is thus in part motivated by the type of film he wishes to make and British cinema's inability or unwillingness to make them. Unlike the realist cinema of filmmakers such as Loach and Leigh, which Parker has condemned as a 'talking-heads cinema', consisting of little more visually than a series of close-ups (Park, 1984: 104), Jordan, has a 'very visual imagination [...] that involves creating stuff that you can only do on large budgets' (Falsetto, 1999: 186).

⁴¹ See Jarman (1984: 234) and Greenaway's comments in Smith (2000: 100).

Thus, unlike Loach and Leigh, the majority of whose works operate equally well in cinemas or on television, the largely television-led distribution offered by Film on Four - who produced both *Angel* and *The Company of Wolves* - did not suit his ambitions, and he 'thought himself condemned to have to encounter the [Hollywood] system to explore the thing [he] want[ed] to do' (Falsetto, 1999: 186).

While Jordan may be partly correct when he asserts that 'it's silly to pretend that you've no relationship with Hollywood. Every director does, anywhere in the world, even independent directors, because in the end their films have to be distributed by that system' (Falsetto, 1999: 186), it would be incorrect to assume that Roeg and Jordan were the only British art filmmakers with a notably visual imagination, and that Hollywood was the only option available to such visually ambitious directors. For example, contemporary British art cinema's two most notorious 'visualists', Jarman and Greenaway, have had no ties with Hollywood studios or American finance in their films. Rather, they sought funding for their projects from a number of European countries and even Japan⁴², which in the case of Greenaway, have become increasingly ambitious and expensive. His films remain deceptively low budget, however. For example, the visual grandeur - some might even argue excess - of *Prospero's Books* was achieved on a budget of as little as £1.5 million (approximately \$2.7 million), leading one British critic to proclaim the film, with its vast array of special effects, as '*Terminator 2* for the art house market, with 3% of the cost' (Turman, 2000: 148). In light of such achievements, one would hope that Petit's dream of a £100,000 European-style cinema may be possible after all, albeit on a slightly grander, though not incomparable scale. Productions such as

⁴² 'Uplink', a Japanese company, co-produced Jarman's *Edward II* and *Blue*, and Greenaway's digital and computer post-production work on *Prospero's Books* was made possible by NHK Tokyo.

Jarman's *The Garden*, Greenaway's *The Pillow Book*, Potter's *The Tango Lesson*, Loach's *Land and Freedom* and Leigh's *Topsy-Turvy* do indeed demonstrate that British filmmakers can look to Europe and the rest of the world - rather than Hollywood - for support in making 'imaginative, visually stimulating film' (Murphy, 2000: 6).

However, Hill has noted that the 'consolidation of a British art cinema [...] not only depended upon the emergence of a number of talented filmmakers but also a structure of support which made their work possible' (2000 (a): 18), and the fact that productions such as those listed above often had to scrape their modest budget together from numerous international sources, only serves to highlight the increasing marginalisation of these filmmakers and the art cinema they represent by the mainstream and key funding institutions of the British film industry.⁴³ The 1993 Cannes Film Festival saw two British films in competition - *Naked* and *Raining Stones* - and two, *The Baby of Mâcon* and *Wittgenstein*, shown outside of competition.⁴⁴ Both Leigh's film and Loach's went on to win major prizes, and Greenaway's provided one of the greatest critical controversies of the festival's history. If British art cinema has arguably never been so visibly high profile and critically celebrated by the international art cinema community than it was at that point, it was also largely self-sufficient. Indeed, if *The Baby of Mâcon* was very much a European production, with funding drawn for four E.U. countries, including Britain,⁴⁵ the other three films were undeniably British, funded collectively by Film

⁴³ See, for example, Christie (1997: 38-40) and (2000: 71-3); Potter (1997: v-x); Tonkin (1997: 37-40) and Miller (2000: 37-47).

⁴⁴ *Naked* won the prizes for both Best Director and Best Actor (David Thewlis) and *Raining Stones* won the Jury Prize.

⁴⁵ The film was a co-production between Britain, France, Germany and The Netherlands.

Four, British Screen and the British Film Institute.⁴⁶ Soon after, however, the international co-production model increasingly became the norm. Works such as *Land and Freedom*, Loach's Spanish Civil War drama, his contribution to the more recent *Tracks* (2005) and Greenaway's *Tulse Luper Trilogy* are 'truly European [...] in all respects' (2000: 71), a fact which, coupled with the omnipresent influence of Hollywood, has made it increasingly difficult to speak of a 'British' art cinema.

⁴⁶ *Naked* was funded by Film Four International and British Screen. *Raining Stones* solely by Channel Four and *Wittgenstein* by Channel Four and the British Film Institute.

Conclusion.

This thesis has argued that Britain, over the last quarter of the twentieth century, developed its first fully-fledged art cinema in the European tradition. Indeed, in the work of directors such as Derek Jarman, Peter Greenaway, Ken Loach, Mike Leigh, Terence Davies, Sally Potter, Chris Petit and Neil Jordan, Britain has produced an art cinema that is auteur-based and internationally recognised. However, it has also been somewhat marginalised and overlooked in its own country. A reason for this can perhaps be found in the failure of British critics to reconcile the mixture of realism and formal complexity in a film such as Davies' *Distant Voices, Still Lives*. There still exists something of a preference for realism and a suspicion towards 'art' in what British critics see as their art cinema. While there has been a recent 'critical attempt to construct a British anti-realist cinema' (Lovell, 1997: 239), stemming from the work of Powell and Pressburger, there is something rather reductive about this tendency to herd great British filmmakers, past and present, into opposing camps which their work may only tenuously fit in. (Could, for example, the more poetic realism of Jennings and Douglas sit unproblematically next to the work of Grierson and the British New Wave? And what of the work of Anderson, which traversed the chasm between naturalism and extreme anti-realism, sometimes within the same film?) What British critics should come to accept, and embrace, is the fact that British cinema, and British art cinema in particular, contains contradictions. However, it also contains multitudes.

Films such as *Radio On* and *Angel* are not isolated incidents of the tendency to combine art film themes and techniques with more recognisable elements of genre

cinema. This eclecticism is a characteristic that carries over into many other British art films, which often defy easy classification.¹ A film such as *Distant Voices, Still Lives* should not be viewed as merely a kitchen sink drama in the social-realist tradition *or* and a highly formal examination of time and memory, it is a original and complex hybrid which is at all times both these things. Simultaneously, it is also an autobiographical film, a musical and a costume drama. Similarly, a film such as *Orlando* can at once be looked upon as a an example of a heritage film, as a woman's film and as a work which maintains elements of Potter's feminist avant-garde film practice.² These films, and others, such as *The Garden*, *The Pillow Book* and *Topsy-Turvy* are self-consciously eclectic, each blending a wide variety of influences, genres, filmmaking styles and techniques into fascinating and original works. The common thread that links them is the fact that they can all be considered art films, and by extension, part of a larger British art cinema.

This new British art cinema has come under criticism for containing 'no central core or manifesto, no common theme linking its disparate parts' (Orr, 2000: 21), and the concerns and individual styles of these filmmakers seem so wide ranging as to be almost impossible to lump together. How does one, for example, reconcile the naturalistic style and social concerns of Loach with Greenaway's 'self-conscious excursions into private myth' (Andrew, 1989: 120) and attempts to build a post-modern meta-cinema? However, art cinema has always been something of a vague term that has allowed for such disparity of styles and concerns, and individual expression. Films such as *My Name is Joe* and *The Draughtsman's Contract*, despite their obvious differences, can both be considered art films because they share certain

¹ Higson, in his introduction to *Dissolving Views*, notes 'several interesting overlaps' (1996: 6) in the categorization of British films examined in the volume.

basic characteristics – such as episodic narratives, ambiguously motivated characters, unresolved endings - that distinguish them from the mainstream Hollywood model of filmmaking. Therefore, the British art cinema can contain the work of both Loach and Greenaway without contradiction.

Britain has thus produced an art cinema that is comparable to its European counterparts in France, Italy and Germany in that it is complex and multi-faceted, incorporating the work of a number of highly distinctive, and even idiosyncratic, individuals. This thesis has illustrated this fact through an examination of the individual filmmaking practices of the leading filmmakers of British art cinema, assessing how these practices placed them within the context of European forbears and counterparts and the extent to which they conformed to or deviated from accepted definitions of the term ‘art cinema’. The advantage of this methodology is that it has made for a wide breadth of analysis, covering, in many cases several films by each director, giving a greater sense of their oeuvres as a whole. Furthermore, centering the Chapters on examinations of realism and narrative in their work, as well as a more selective examination of the relationship between some of these filmmakers and the avant-garde or Hollywood genre cinema, has made it easier to provide a comparative study of their work, highlighting subtle as well as more apparent similarities and differences.

This approach also has its limitations, however. For example, the breadth of analysis has come at the expense of some depth in the analysis of individual films. Furthermore, the decision to concentrate on the works of filmmakers, who with the possible exception of Petit have established international reputations, has left little room for the examination of lesser-known directors and films, such as Patrick

² See Higson (1996: 6-7).

Keiller's *London* (1994), Chris Newby's *Madagascar Skin* (1995) Andrew Kötting's *Gallivant* (1997) and John Maybury's *Love is the Devil* (1998).

Indeed, there remains a great deal of work to be done by future researchers on the subject of British art cinema. Not least, the work of this younger generation of British art filmmakers such as Kötting, Keiller, Newby, Maybury, Isaac Julien and the British based animators Stephen and Timothy Quay deserve more critical attention and in-depth scrutiny. Also, the place in contemporary British art cinema of directors such as Michael Winterbottom, Peter Mullan and Pawel Pawlikowski, whose work perhaps possess more mainstream characteristics and appeal, requires further examination and assessment.

The topics of the individual Chapters in this thesis would, however, continue to be relevant to an examination of the work of these younger British filmmakers. For example, this thesis has not provided an examination of the changing face of realism in British cinema over the course of the 1990s. So-called 'Brit Grit' films such as Gary Oldman's *Nil By Mouth*, Shane Meadows' *Twentyfourseven* and Tim Roth's *The War Zone*, were unquestionably works in the British social-realist tradition typified by Loach. A more anti-realist aesthetic could, however, be found in works such as *Love is the Devil* and *Institute Benjamenta*, which betray the influence of Jarman and Greenaway as well as Powell and Ken Russell. Other contemporary films, such as *Gallivant* and *London*, with their combination of fictional and documentary elements, present an even more complex engagement with traditions of British realism. Furthermore, the feature films of both Kötting and Keiller, as well as Maybury, Julien and the Quay Brothers could be examined - like that of Jarman, Greenaway and Potter - in the context of their earlier work in the avant-garde, forging yet another link between the two generations of filmmakers within British art cinema.

Ultimately, art cinema, through the emergence of a large number of talented filmmakers, a structure of financial support and the virtual collapse of the mainstream, came to be the dominant voice in British filmmaking in the 1980s up to the early 1990s. However, it seemed to go into a steady decline following the death of Jarman, perhaps its most recognisable and certainly most controversial exponent, in 1994, and the gradual regeneration of the mainstream of the British film industry, which spurred on by the runaway success of *Four Weddings and a Funeral* (1994), and later *Trainspotting* (1996) and *The Full Monty* (1997), began to display a ‘newfound energy, confidence and optimism’ (Watson, 2000: 80) and once again sought to compete directly with Hollywood. This has unfortunately left this younger generation of British art filmmakers without the same financial support structure, and therefore somewhat marginalised in the contemporary climate of British cinema. However, if it is somewhat difficult to be optimistic about the future of art filmmaking in Britain, this thesis has hopefully demonstrated that Britain has, of late, produced an internationally recognized art cinema containing a fascinating and varied canon of films, which are ripe for rediscovery and further serious critical attention.

Bibliography.

Primary Film Texts: British Art Cinema Feature Films 1975-2000.

Anderson, Lindsay. *Britannia Hospital*, 1982. EMI/Film and General/NFFC, UK.

Clayton, Susan and Jonathan Curling. *The Song of the Shirt*, 1979. BFI.

Cox, Alex. *Sid and Nancy*, 1986. Zenith/Initial, UK.

Cox, Alex. *Revenagers Tragedy*, 2002. The Film Council/Northcroft Films/
Exterminating Angel, UK

Davies, Terence. *The Terence Davies Trilogy*, 1983. British Film Institute/London
Film School, UK.

Davies, Terence. *Distant Voices, Still Lives*, 1988. British Film Institute/Film Four
International, UK.

Davies, Terence. *The Long Day Closes*, 1992. Mayfair/Palace/British Film
Institute/Film Four, UK.

Davies, Terence. *The Neon Bible*, 1995. Artificial Eye/Mayfair/Scala/Channel Four.
UK/US.

Davies, Terence. *The House of Mirth*, 1999. Film Four/The Scottish Council National
Lottery Fund/The Glasgow Film Fund, UK.

Douglas, Bill. *Comrades*, 1986. Curzon/Skreba/NFFC/Film Four International, UK.

Eyre, Richard. *The Ploughman's Lunch*, 1983. Goldcrest/Greenpoint/AC&D, UK.

Frears, Stephen. *My Beautiful Laundrette*. 1985. Working Title/SAF/Channel Four.
UK.

Greenaway, Peter. *The Falls*, 1980. British Film Institute, UK.

Greenaway, Peter. *The Draughtsman's Contract*, 1982. British Film Institute/Channel
Four, UK.

Greenaway, Peter. *A Zed and Two Noughts*. 1985. Artificial Eye/British Film
Institute/Allarts Enterprises/Film Four International, UK/Netherlands.

Greenaway, Peter. *The Belly of an Architect*, 1987. Recorded Releasing/
Mondial/Tangram/Film Four International/British Screen. UK/Italy.

- Greenaway, Peter. *Drowning By Numbers*, 1988. Film Four International/Elsevier Vendex, UK/Netherlands.
- Greenaway, Peter. *The Cook, The Thief, His Wife and Her Lover*, 1989. Palace/Allarts/Erato Films, UK/France.
- Greenaway, Peter. *Prospero's Books*, 1991. Palace/Allarts/Cinea/Camera One/Penta/Elsevier Vendex/Film Four/PRO/Canal Plus/NHK, UK/Netherlands/France/Italy
- Greenaway, Peter. *The Baby of Maçon*, 1993. Allarts/UGC/Cine Electra/Channel Four/Filmstiftung Nordrhein-Westfalen/La Sept Cinema, UK/Germany/Netherlands/France.
- Greenaway, Peter. *The Pillow Book*, 1995. Kassander/Wigman Productions/Woodline Films/Alpha Film/Channel Four Films/Canal Plus/Delux, UK/Netherlands/France.
- Greenaway, Peter. *8½ Women*, 1999. Eurimages/The Dutch Film Fund/The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg Film Fund, UK/Netherlands/Luxembourg/Germany.
- Jarman, Derek. *Sebastiane*, 1976. Meglovision/Cinegate/Distac, UK.
- Jarman, Derek. *Jubilee*, 1977. Meglovision/Whaley-Malin, UK.
- Jarman, Derek. *The Tempest*, 1979. Boyd's Company, UK.
- Jarman, Derek. *In the Shadow of the Sun*, 1980. Dark Pictures/Freunde Der Deutschen Kinemathek, UK/Germany.
- Jarman, Derek. *The Angelic Conversation*, 1985. British Film Institute/Channel Four, UK.
- Jarman, Derek. *Caravaggio*, 1986. British Film Institute/Film Four International. UK.
- Jarman, Derek. *The Last of England*, 1987. Anglo International/British Screen/Channel Four/ZDF, UK/Germany.
- Jarman, Derek. *War Requiem*, 1988. Anglo International Films/Liberty Films/BBC Enterprises, UK.
- Jarman, Derek. *The Garden*, 1990. Baslisk/Channel Four/British Screen/ZDF/Uplink, UK/Germany.
- Jarman, Derek. *Edward II*, 1991. Palace/Working Title/British Screen/BBC Films. UK.
- Jarman, Derek. *Wittgenstein*, 1992. British Film Institute/Channel Four/Uplink/Bandung, UK.

- Jarman, Derek. *Blue*, 1993. Baselisk Communications/Uplink/Channel Four, UK.
- Jordan, Neil. *Angel*, 1982. Motion Picture Company of Ireland/Irish Film Board/Channel Four International, UK.
- Jordan, Neil. *The Company of Wolves*, 1984. Palace/ITC/Film Four, UK.
- Jordan, Neil. *Mona Lisa*, 1986. Palace Pictures/Handmade Films, UK.
- Jordan, Neil. *The Crying Game*, 1992. Palace Pictures/Channel Four/Eurotrustees/ZDF/British Screen, UK.
- Jordan, Neil. *The Butcher Boy*, 1997. Warner/Geffen Pictures, Ireland/US.
- Jordan, Neil. *The Good Thief*, 2002. Alliance Atlantis, UK/France.
- Julien, Isaac. *Young Soul Rebels*, 1991. British Film Institute/Film Four/Sankofa/La Sept ARTE/Kinowelt/Beroamericana, UK.
- Keiller, Patrick. *London*, 1994. British Film Institute/Konick/Channel Four, UK.
- Keiller, Patrick. *Robinson in Space*, 1997. British Film Institute/Konick/BBC, UK.
- Kötting, Andrew. *Gallivant*, 1996. British Film Institute/Electric/Tall Stories/Channel Four/The Arts Council of England, UK.
- Kötting, Andrew. *This Filthy Earth*, 2000. The Film Council/Pathé, UK.
- Leigh, Mike. *High Hopes*, 1988. Portman/Film Four/British Screen, UK.
- Leigh, Mike. *Life is Sweet*, 1991. Thin Man Films/Film Four International/British Screen, UK.
- Leigh, Mike. *Naked*, 1993. Thin Man Films/British Screen/First Independent/Film Four International/British Screen, UK.
- Leigh, Mike. *Secrets and Lies*, 1995. CiBy 2000/Thin Man Films/Channel Four Films, UK.
- Leigh, Mike. *Career Girls*, 1997. Thin Man Films/Channel Four Films, UK.
- Leigh, Mike. *Topsy-Turvy*, 1999. Thin Man Films/The Greenlight Fund/Newmarket Capital Group, UK.
- Leigh, Mike. *All Or Nothing*, 2002. CBY2000/UGC, UK/France.
- Loach, Ken. *Looks and Smiles*, 1981. Black Lion Films/Kestral Films/MK2 Productions, UK.

- Loach, Ken. *Fatherland*, 1986. Kestrel II Films/Film Four International/MK2/ZDF/Clasart Films, UK/France/West Germany.
- Loach, Ken. *Hidden Agenda*, 1990. Initial Film/Hemdale, UK.
- Loach, Ken. *Riff-Raff*, 1991. Channel Four, UK.
- Loach, Ken. *Raining Stones*, 1993. Channel Four, UK.
- Loach, Ken. *Ladybird, Ladybird*, 1994. Four Four International, UK.
- Loach, Ken. *Land and Freedom*, 1995. Parallax Pictures/Messidor Films/Road Movies Dritte Produktionen, UK/Spain/Germany.
- Loach, Ken. *Carla's Song*, 1996. Parallax Pictures/Channel Four Films/Road Movies Dritte Produktionen/Tornasol Films SA, UK/Germany/Spain.
- Loach, Ken. *My Name is Joe*, 1998. Parallax Pictures/Channel Four International/Road Films/Vierte Produktionen/Tornasol Films SA/La Sept ARTE/The Scottish Arts Council National Lottery Fund/The Glasgow Film Fund, UK/Germany/Spain/France.
- Loach, Ken. *Bread and Roses*, 1999. Parallax Pictures/Film Four/Road Films/Tornasol-Alta Films SA/British Screen/BSkyB/BAC Films/BIM Distribuzione/Cineart/Film Co-operative Zurich/WDR/La Sept ARTE/ARD-Digeto Films/Filmstiftung Nordrhein-Westfalen, UK/Germany/Spain/France/Italy.
- Loach, Ken. *The Navigators*, 2000. British Film Institute/Film Four, UK.
- Loach, Ken. *Sweet Sixteen*, 2002. Sixteen Films/Road Movies Filmproduktion/Tornasol-Alta Films/Scottish Screen/BBC Films/Filmstiftung Nordrhein-Westfalen/The Glasgow Film Office/BIM Distribuzione/Diaphana Distribution/Cineart/ARD-Digeto Films/WDR, UK/Germany/Spain.
- Maybury, John. *Love is the Devil: Study for a Portrait of Francis Bacon*, 1999. BBC Films/British Film Institute/Premiere Heure/Uplink/Arts Council of England/Partners in Crime/State, UK.
- Mullan, Peter. *Orphans*, 1998. Channel Four Films/The Scottish Council National Lottery Fund/The Glasgow Film Fund, UK.
- Mullan, Peter. *The Magdalene Sisters*, 2002. Scottish Screen/The Film Council/Irish Film Board/Bord Scannan Na Heirean, UK/Ireland.
- Newby, Chris. *Madagascar Skin*, 1995. British Film Institute/Channel Four, UK.
- O'Connor, Pat. *Cal*, 1984. Warner/Goldcrest/Enigma, UK/US.

- Oldman, Gary. *Nil By Mouth*, 1997. TCF/SE8, UK.
- Peck, Ron. *Nighthawks*, 1977. British Film Institute/Cinegate/Nashburgh/Four Corner Films, UK.
- Peck, Ron. *Empire State*, 1987. Miracle/Virgin, UK.
- Petit, Chris. *Radio On*, 1979. British Film Institute/Road Movies Filmproduktion, UK/Germany.
- Petit, Chris. *An Unsuitable Job For a Woman*, 1982. Goldcrest/NFFC/Boyd's Company, UK.
- Petit, Chris. *Flight to Berlin*, 1983. British Film Institute/Road Movies Filmproduktion, UK/Germany.
- Petit, Chris. *Chinese Boxes*, 1984. Palace/Road Movies, UK/Germany.
- Poliakoff, Stephen. *Close My Eyes*, 1991. Artificial Eye/Beambright/Film Four. UK.
- Potter, Sally. *The Gold Diggers*, 1984. British Film Institute. UK.
- Potter, Sally. *Orlando*, 1993. Adventure Pictures/Lenfilm/Mikado Films/Rio/Sigma Filmproductions/British Screen, UK/Netherlands/Italy/France/Russia.
- Potter, Sally. *The Tango Lesson*, 1997. Adventure Pictures/OKCK Films/PIE/NDF/Imagica/Pandora Films/Sigma Pictures/The Arts Council of England/The European Co-Production Fund/The Sales Company/Eurimages/Medien-und-Filmgesellschaft Baden-Wurttemberg/NPS TV Cobo Fund, UK/Netherlands/Germany/Argentina/Japan.
- Potter, Sally. *The Man Who Cried*, 1999. Adventure Pictures/Studio Canal/Universal Pictures/Working Title, UK/US/France.
- Quay, Stephen and Timothy. *Institute Benjamenta*, 1995. ICA/British Screen/Channel Four/Image/Pandora, UK.
- Roeg, Nicolas. *The Man Who Fell to Earth*, 1976. British Lion, UK.
- Roeg, Nicolas. *Bad Timing*, 1980. Rank/Recorded Picture Company. UK.
- Roeg, Nicolas. *Eureka*, 1982. MGM/UA/RPC/JF, UK/US.
- Roeg, Nicolas. *Insignificance*, 1985. Zenith/Recorded Picture Company. UK.
- Roeg, Nicolas. *Castaway*, 1986. Canon/United British Artists. UK.
- Roeg, Nicolas. *Track 29*, 1988. Recorded Releasing/Handmade Films. UK.

Roeg, Nicolas. *Two Deaths*, 1995. British Screen/BBC Films, UK.

Roth, Tim. *The War Zone*, 1998. Film Four/Fandango/Mikado Films, UK.

Russell, Ken. *Tommy*, 1975. Hemdale, UK.

Russell, Ken. *Valentino*, 1977. UA/Appature/Chartoff-Winkler, UK.

Russell, Ken. *Lisztomania*, 1979. Warner/VPS/Goodtimes, UK.

Russell, Ken. *The Lair of the White Worm*, 1988. Vestron, UK.

Russell, Ken. *The Rainbow*, 1989. Vestron, UK.

Shabazz, Menelik. *Burning an Illusion*, 1981. British Film Institute. UK.

Watkins, Peter. *Edvard Munch*, 1976. New Yorker/SA, Norway/Sweedon.

Wollen, Peter and Laura Mulvey. *Riddles of the Sphinx*, 1977. British Film Institute, UK.

Wollen, Peter and Laura Mulvey. *Crystal Gazing*, 1982. British Film Institute, UK.

Wollen, Peter. *Friendship's Death*, 1987. British Film Institute, UK.

Primary Texts 2: British Art Cinema Shorts and Television Films 1975-2000.

Davies, Terence. *Children*, 1976. British Film Institute, UK.

Davies, Terence. *Madonna and Child*, 1980. British Film Institute, UK.

Davies, Terence. *Death and Transfiguration*, 1983. British Film Institute, UK.

Douglas, Bill. *My Childhood*, 1972. British Film Institute, UK.

Douglas, Bill. *My Ain Folks*, 1973. British Film Institute, UK.

Douglas, Bill. *My Way Home*, 1978. British Film Institute, UK.

Greenaway, Peter. *Vertical Features Remake*, 1978.

Greenaway, Peter. *A Walk Through H*, 1978. British Film Institute, UK.

Greenaway, Peter. *A TV Dante*, 1990. Channel Four, UK.

Jarman, Derek. *Broken English*, 1979. Island Records, US/UK.

Jarman, Derek. *The Queen is Dead*, 1986. Warner Music Vision.

Julien, Isaac. *Territories*, 1984. Sankofa, UK.

Julien, Isaac. *Passion of Remembrance*, 1986. British Film Institute/Sankofa, UK.

Julien, Isaac. *Looking for Langston*, 1988. British Film Institute, UK.

Leigh, Mike. *Nuts in May*, 1975. BBC Worldwide, UK.

Leigh, Mike. *Abigail's Party*, 1977. BBC Television, UK.

Leigh, Mike. *Grown-Ups*, 1980. BBC Television, UK.

Leigh, Mike. *Meantime*, 1983. Channel Four, UK.

Leigh, Mike. *Four Days in July*, 1984. BBC Television, UK.

Loach, Ken. *Questions of Leadership*, 1983. Channel Four, UK.
 Loach, Ken. *Which Side are You On?*, 1985. Channel Four, UK.
 Mullan, Peter. *Fridge*, 1996. Scottish Screen, UK.
 Petit, Chris. *The Cardinal and the Corpse*, 1992. Channel Four, UK.
 Petit, Chris. *The Falconer*, 1997. Channel Four, UK.
 Petit, Chris. *Asylum*, 2000. Channel Four, UK.
 Potter, Sally. *Thriller*, 1979. British Film Institute, UK.
 Quay, Stephen and Timothy. *Street of Crocodiles*, 1986. BFI, UK.
 Russell, Ken. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 1993. BBC, UK.

Other Films Viewed and Cited.

Akerman, Chantal. *Jeanne Dielman, 23 Qui du Commerce 1080 Bruxelles*, 1975.
 Anderson, Lindsay. *The Wakefield Express*, 1952.
 Anderson, Lindsay. *O Dreamland*, 1953.
 Anderson, Lindsay. *Every Day Except Christmas*, 1957.
 Anderson, Lindsay. *This Sporting Life*, 1963.
 Anderson, Lindsay. *The White Bus*, 1967.
 Anderson, Lindsay. *If...*, 1968.
 Anderson, Lindsay. *O Lucky Man!*, 1973.
 Anger, Kenneth. *Fireworks*, 1947.
 Anger, Kenneth. *Eau d'artifice*, 1953.
 Anger, Kenneth. *Inauguration of the Pleasure Dome*, 1957
 Anger, Kenneth. *Scorpio Rising*, 1964.
 Anger, Kenneth. *Kustom Kar Kommandos*, 1964.
 Anger, Kenneth. *Invocation of my Demon Brother*, 1969.
 Anger, Kenneth. *Lucifer Rising*, 1980.
 Antonioni, Michelangelo. *L'Avventura*, 1960.
 Antonioni, Michelangelo. *La Notte*, 1961.
 Antonioni, Michelangelo. *L'Eclisse*, 1962.
 Antonioni, Michelangelo. *Blow Up*, 1966.
 Antonioni, Michelangelo. *Zabriskie Point*, 1970.
 Antonioni, Michelangelo. *The Passenger*, 1975.
 Araki, Gregg. *The Living End*, 1992.
 Arzner, Dorothy. *Dance Girl Dance*, 1940.
 Asquith, Anthony. *Pygmalion*, 1938.
 Asquith, Anthony. *The Winslow Boy*, 1948.
 Asquith, Anthony. *The Importance of Being Earnest*, 1952.
 Attenborough, Richard. *Gandhi*, 1982.
 Barney, Mathew. *Cremaster*, 1995-2002.
 Bergman, Ingmar. *The Seventh Seal*, 1957.
 Bergman, Ingmar. *Wild Strawberries*, 1957
 Bergman, Ingmar. *The Virgin Spring*, 1960
 Bergman, Ingmar. *Persona*, 1966.
 Bergman, Ingmar. *Hour of the Wolf*, 1967.
 Bernard, Chris. *Letter to Brezhnev*, 1985.
 Berri, Claude. *Jean de Florette*, 1986.

Berri, Claude. *Manon du source*, 1986.

Berri, Claude. *Germinal*, 1993.

Bertolucci, Bernardo. *The Conformist*, 1970.

Bertolucci, Bernardo. *Last Tango In Paris*, 1972.

Boulting, John. *Private's Progress*, 1956.

Boorman, John. *Catch Us if You Can*, 1965.

Boorman, John. *Point Blank*, 1967.

Boorman, John. *Leo the Last*, 1970.

Boorman, John. *Excalibur*, 1981.

Boyle, Danny. *Trainspotting*, 1996.

Brakhage, Stan. *Anticipation of the Night*, 1962.

Brakhage, Stan. *Mothlight*, 1965.

Brakhage, Stan. *Dog Star Man*, 1966-9.

Brakhage, Stan. *Dante's Inferno*, 1979.

Bresson, Robert. *Diary of a Country Priest*, 1950.

Bresson, Robert. *Pickpocket*, 1959.

Bresson, Robert. *Mouchette*, 1967.

Bresson, Robert. *Four Nights of a Dreamer*, 1971.

Bresson, Robert. *L'argent*, 1983.

Buñuel, Luis and Salvador Dali. *Un Chien Andalou*, 1929.

Buñuel, Luis and Salvador Dali. *L'Age d'Or*, 1930.

Buñuel, Luis. *The Exterminating Angel*, 1962.

Cammell, Donald. *Demonseed*, 1976.

Cammell, Donald. *The White of the Eye*, 1985.

Cammell, Donald. *Wild Side*, 1995-9.

Carne, Marcel. *Quai des Brumes*, 1938.

Carne, Marcel. *Le Jour se Lève*, 1939.

Cataneo, Peter. *The Full Monty*, 1997.

Cavalcanti, Alberto et al. *Dead of Night*, 1945.

Cavalcanti, Alberto. *Rien que les Heures*, 1926.

Cavalcanti, Alberto. *Pett and Pott*, 1934.

Cavalcanti, Alberto. *Coal Face*, 1935.

Cavalcanti, Alberto. *They Made me a Fugitive*, 1947.

Chabrol, Claude. *Le Beau Serge*, 1957.

Chaplin, Charles. *The Gold Rush*, 1925.

Chytilová, Vera. *Daisies*, 1966.

Chytilová, Vera. *The Fruit of the Tree*, 1969.

Clair, René. *À Nous la Liberté*, 1931.

Clark, Alan. *Scum*, 1979.

Clayton, Jack. *Room at the Top*, 1958.

Clayton, Jack. *The Innocents*, 1961.

Clayton, Jack. *The Pumpkin Eater*, 1964.

Cocteau, Jean. *Blood of a Poet*, 1930.

Cocteau, Jean. *La Belle et la Bête*, 1946.

Cocteau, Jean. *Orphée*, 1950.

Cocteau, Jean. *Testament of Orpheus*, 1959.

Collard, Cyril. *Savage Nights*, 1992.

Corman, Roger. *The Masque of the Red Death*, 1964.

Cox, Alex. *Repo Man*, 1984.

Cox, Alex. *Walker*, 1987.
 Curtiz, Michael. *The Adventures of Robin Hood*, 1939.
 Crichton, Charles. *The Lavender Hill Mob*, 1951.
 Dearden, Basil. *The Blue Lamp*, 1949.
 Dearden, Basil. *Violent Playground*, 1958.
 Dearden, Basil. *Sapphire*, 1959.
 Dearden, Basil. *Victim*, 1961.
 Dearden, Basil. *A Place to Go*, 1963.
 Debord, Guy. *Hurlements en faveur de Sade*, 1952.
 Demme, Jonathan. *Philadelphia*, 1993.
 De Palma, Brian. *Blow Out*, 1981.
 Deren, Maya. *Meshes in the Afternoon*, 1947.
 Deren, Maya. *At Land*, 1944.
 Deren, Maya. *Study in Choreography for the Camera*, 1945.
 De Sica, Vittorio. *Shoeshine*, 1946.
 De Sica, Vittorio. *Bicycle Thieves*, 1948.
 De Sica, Vittorio. *Miracle in Milan*, 1951.
 De Sica, Vittorio. *Umberto D.*, 1952.
 Dickinson, Thorold. *The Arsenal Stadium Mystery*, 1939.
 Dickinson, Thorold. *Gaslight*, 1940.
 Dickinson, Thorold. *Men of Two Worlds*, 1946.
 Dickinson, Thorold. *Secret People*, 1952.
 Donen, Stanley. *Funny Face*, 1956.
 Dreyer, Carl Theodore. *The Passion of Joan of Arc*, 1928.
 Dreyer, Carl Theodore. *Vampyr*, 1932.
 Dreyer, Carl Theodore. *Day of Wrath*, 1943.
 Dreyer, Carl Theodore. *Ordet*, 1954.
 Dreyer, Carl Theodore. *Gertrude*, 1964.
 Dudow, Slatan. *Kuhle Wampe*, 1932.
 Dulac, Germaine. *The Smiling Madame Beudet*, 1923.
 Duvivier, Julien. *Pépé le Moko*, 1937.
 Edel, Ulrich. *Christiane F.*, 1981.
 Eisenstein, Sergei. *Strike*, 1924.
 Eisenstein, Sergei. *Battleship Potemkin*, 1925.
 Eisenstein, Sergei. *October*, 1928.
 Eisenstein, Sergei. *Alexander Nevsky*, 1938.
 Epstein, Jean. *The Fall of the House of Usher*, 1928.
 Fassbinder, Rainer Werner. *Beware of a Holy Whore*, 1970.
 Fassbinder, Rainer Werner. *Nora Helmer*, 1973.
 Fassbinder, Rainer Werner. *Effi Briest*, 1974.
 Fassbinder, Rainer Werner. *Mother Kuster's Trip to Heaven*, 1975.
 Fassbinder, Rainer Werner. *Despair*, 1978.
 Fassbinder, Rainer Werner. *The Marriage of Maria Braun*, 1978.
 Fassbinder, Rainer Werner. *Berlin Alexanderplatz*, 1981.
 Fassbinder, Rainer Werner. *Lola*, 1982.
 Fassbinder, Rainer Werner. *Veronika Voss*, 1982.
 Fassbinder, Rainer Werner. *Querelle*, 1982.
 Fellini, Federico. *La Strada*, 1954.
 Fellini, Federico. *Le Notti di Cabiria*, 1957.

Fellini, Federico. *La Dolce Vita*, 1960.
 Fellini, Federico. *8½*, 1963.
 Fellini, Federico. *Fellini Satyricon*, 1969.
 Fellini, Federico. *The Clowns*, 1970.
 Fellini, Federico. *Fellini's Roma*, 1972.
 Fellini, Federico. *Amarcord*, 1974.
 Fellini, Federico. *Fellini's Cassanova*, 1976.
 Ferreri, Marco. *La Grande Bouffe*, 1973.
 Flemming, Victor. *Gone with the Wind*, 1939.
 Flemming, Victor and King Vidor. *The Wizard of Oz*, 1939.
 Figgis, Mike. *Leaving Las Vegas*, 1995.
 Figgis, Mike. *The Loss of Sexual Innocence*, 1999.
 Figgis, Mike. *Timecode*, 2000.
 Figgis, Mike. *Hotel*, 2001.
 Ford, John. *Stagecoach*, 1939.
 Ford, John. *The Grapes of Wrath*, 1940.
 Ford, John. *My Darling Clementine*, 1946.
 Ford, John. *The Searchers*, 1956.
 Forman, Milos. *The Loves of a Blonde*, 1965.
 Forman, Milos. *The Fireman's Ball*, 1967.
 Forman, Milos. *Amadeus*, 1984.
 Frampton, Hollis. *Zorn's Lemma*, 1970.
 Frampton, Hollis. *Hapax Legomena*, 1971-2.
 Franju, George. *Le Sang des Bêtes*, 1949.
 Franju, George. *Les Yeux sans Visage*, 1959.
 Frears, Stephen. *Dangerous Liaisons*, 1988.
 Friend, Charles. *The Cruel Sea*, 1953.
 Gance, Able. *Napoleon*, 1927.
 Genet Jean. *Un Chant D'Amour*, 1950.
 George, Terry. *Some Mother's Son*, 1996.
 Gilbert, Lewis. *Reach for the Sky*, 1956.
 Gilbert, Lewis. *Carve Her Name with Pride*, 1958.
 Gilbert, Lewis. *Sink the Bismarck!*, 1960.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *A Bout de Souffle*, 1959.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *Vive sa vie*, 1962.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *Le Mépris*, 1963.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *Les Carabiniers*, 1963.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *Bandé a part*, 1964.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *Alphaville*, 1965.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *Pierrot le Fou*, 1965.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *La Chinoise*, 1967.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *Weekend*, 1967.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *Vent d'Est*, 1969.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *Tout va Bien*, 1972.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *Slow Motion*, 1980.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *Passion*, 1982.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *Hail, Mary*, 1985.
 Godard, Jean-Luc. *Eloge de L'Amour*, 1999.
 Goretta, Claude and Alan Tanner. *Nice Time*, 1957.

Greenaway, Peter. *The Tulse Luper Suitcases: The Story of Moab*, 2003.

Greenaway, Peter. *The Tulse Luper Suitcases: From Sark to Finish*, 2003.

Greenaway, Peter. *The Tulse Luper Suitcases: Vaux to the Sea*, 2004.

Griffith, D.W. *The Birth of a Nation*, 1915.

Griffith, D.W. *Broken Blossoms*, 1919.

Griffith, D.W. *Way Down East*, 1920.

Griffith, D.W. *Orphans of the Storm*, 1921.

Guillermin, John. *I Was Monty's Double*, 1958.

Hamer, Robert. *Kind Hearts and Coronets*, 1949.

Hamilton, Guy. *The Colditz Story*, 1954.

Has, Wojciech. *The Saragossa Manuscript*, 1965.

Haynes, Todd. *Poison*, 1990.

Hawks, Howard. *Rio Bravo*, 1959.

Heffron, Richard T. *Outlaw Blues*, 1977.

Hellman, Monte. *Two-Lane Blacktop*, 1971.

Herzog, Werner. *Fata Morgana*, 1971.

Herzog, Werner. *Stroszek*, 1976.

Hitchcock, Alfred. *The Lady Vanishes*, 1938.

Hodges, Mike. *Get Carter*, 1971.

Hopper, Dennis. *Easy Rider*, 1969.

Jancsó, Miklós. *The Round-Up*, 1966.

Jancsó, Miklós. *The Red and the White*, 1967.

Jancsó, Miklós. *Red Psalm*, 1971.

Jancsó, Miklós. *Elektra, My Love*, 1975.

Jarmusch, Jim. *Dead Man*, 1995.

Jennings, Humphrey. *Spare Time*, 1940.

Jennings, Humphrey. *Listen to Britain*, 1942.

Jennings, Humphrey. *Fires Were Started*, 1943.

Jennings, Humphrey. *Diary for Timothy*, 1945.

Jordan, Neil. *High Spirits*, 1988.

Jordan, Neil. *We're No Angels*, 1989.

Kiarostami, Abbas. *Close-Up*, 1989.

Kiarostami, Abbas. *Ten*, 2002.

King, Henry. *Carousel*, 1956.

Kluge, Alexander. *The Power of Emotions*, 1983.

Koster, Henry. *The Robe*, 1953.

Kubelka, Peter. *Adebar*, 1957.

Kubelka, Peter. *Schwechater*, 1958.

Kubrick, Stanley. *2001: A Space Odyssey*, 1968.

Kurosawa, Akira. *Rashomon*, 1950.

Kurosawa, Akira. *The Seven Samurai*, 1954.

Kurosawa, Akira. *Throne of Blood*, 1957.

Kurosawa, Akira. *The Hidden Fortress*, 1958.

Kurosawa, Akira. *Yojombo*, 1961.

Kurosawa, Akira. *Sanjuro*, 1962.

Kurosawa, Akira. *High and Low*, 1963.

Kurosawa, Akira. *Ran*, 1985.

Lang, Fritz. *M*, 1931.

Lauder, Frank. *The Happiest Days of Your Life*, 1950.

Lean, David. *Great Expectations*, 1946.
 Lean, David. *Oliver Twist*, 1948.
 Lean, David. *Lawrence of Arabia*, 1962.
 Lean, David. *Doctor Zhivago*, 1965.
 Lee, Jack. *The Wooden Horse*, 1950.
 Le Grice, Malcolm. *Berlin Horse*, 1970.
 Leigh, Mike. *Bleak Moments*, 1971.
 Leigh, Mike. *Hard Labour*, 1973.
 Leigh, Mike. *Vera Drake*, 2004.
 Lenica, Jan and Walerian Borowczyk. *Once Upon a Time*, 1958.
 Leone, Sergio. *A Fistful of Dollars*, 1964.
 LeRoy, Mervyn. *The Gold Diggers of 1933*, 1933.
 Lester, Richard. *It's Trad Dad*, 1962.
 Lester, Richard. *A Hard Day's Night*, 1964.
 Lester, Richard. *Help*, 1965.
 Lester, Richard. *The Knack...and How to Get It*, 1965.
 Lester, Richard. *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum*, 1966.
 Lester, Richard. *Petulia*, 1968.
 Loach, Ken. *Cathy Come Home*, 1966.
 Loach, Ken. *Poor Cow*, 1967.
 Loach, Ken. *Kes*, 1969.
 Loach, Ken. *Family Life*, 1971.
 Loach, Ken. *The Wind That Shakes the Barley*, 2006.
 Losey, Joseph. *The Criminal*, 1960.
 Losey, Joseph. *The Servant*, 1963.
 Losey, Joseph. *Modesty Blaise*, 1966.
 Losey, Joseph. *Accident*, 1967.
 Losey, Joseph. *Boom*, 1968.
 Losey, Joseph. *Secret Ceremony*, 1968.
 Losey, Joseph. *The Go-Between*, 1970.
 Lye, Len. *Colour Box*, 1935.
 Lynch, David. *Wild at Heart*, 1991.
 Lynch, David. *The Straight Story*, 1999.
 McLaren, Norman. *Neighbours*, 1952.
 McLaren, Norman. *Spheres*, 1955.
 Mackendrick, Alexander. *The Man in the White Suit*, 1951.
 Mackendrick, Alexander. *The Ladykillers*, 1955.
 Makavejev, Dusan. *WR: Mysteries of the Organism*, 1971.
 Minghella, Anthony. *The English Patient*, 1996.
 Murnau, F.W. *The Last Laugh*, 1924.
 Murnau, F.W. *Sunrise*, 1927.
 Newell, Mike. *Four Weddings and a Funeral*, 1994.
 Norman, Leslie. *Dunkirk*, 1958.
 Olivier, Laurence. *Henry V*, 1944.
 Olivier, Laurence. *Hamlet*, 1948.
 Olivier, Laurence. *Richard III*, 1955.
 Olivier, Laurence. *The Prince and the Showgirl*, 1957.
 Ophüls, Max. *Madame de...*, 1953.
 Ophüls, Max. *Lola Montez*, 1955.

Ove, Horace. *Pressure*, 1975.

Pabst, G.W. *Pandora's Box*, 1929.

Pasolini, Pier Paolo. *Accattone*, 1961.

Pasolini, Pier Paolo. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*, 1964.

Pasolini, Pier Paolo. *Oedipus Rex*, 1967.

Pasolini, Pier Paolo. *Porcile*, 1969.

Pasolini, Pier Paolo. *Medea*, 1970.

Pasolini, Pier Paolo. *The Decameron*, 1970.

Pasolini, Pier Paolo. *The Canterbury Tales*, 1971.

Pasolini, Pier Paolo. *The Arabian Nights*, 1974.

Pasolini, Pier Paolo. *Saló, or The 120 Days of Sodom*, 1975.

Penn, Arthur. *Bonnie and Clyde*, 1967.

Polanski, Roman. *Two Men and a Wardrobe*, 1958.

Polanski, Roman. *Knife in the Water*, 1962.

Polanski, Roman. *Repulsion*, 1965.

Polanski, Roman. *Cul-de-Sac*, 1966.

Potter, H.C. *Hellzapoppin'*, 1941.

Powell, Michael. *The Edge of the World*, 1937.

Powell, Michael. *Peeping Tom*, 1959.

Powell, Michael and Emeric Pressburger. *The Spy in Black*, 1939.

Powell, Michael and Emeric Pressburger. *One of Our Aircraft is Missing*, 1941.

Powell, Michael and Emeric Pressburger. *The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp*, 1943.

Powell, Michael and Emeric Pressburger. *A Canterbury Tale*, 1944.

Powell, Michael and Emeric Pressburger. *I Know Where I'm Going*, 1945.

Powell, Michael and Emeric Pressburger. *Black Narcissus*, 1946.

Powell, Michael and Emeric Pressburger. *A Matter of Life and Death*, 1946.

Powell, Michael and Emeric Pressburger. *The Red Shoes*, 1948.

Powell, Michael and Emeric Pressburger. *The Small Black Room*, 1949.

Powell, Michael and Emeric Pressburger. *The Elusive Pimpernel*, 1950.

Powell, Michael and Emeric Pressburger. *Gone to Earth*, 1950.

Powell, Michael and Emeric Pressburger. *The Tales of Hoffman*, 1951.

Michael, Ludwig Burger, Tim Wheland. *The Thief of Baghdad*, 1940.

Rainer, Yvonne. *Lives of Performers*, 1972.

Reed, Carol. *Odd Man Out*, 1947.

Reed, Carol. *The Fallen Idol*, 1948.

Reed, Carol. *The Third Man*, 1949.

Reisz, Karel and Tony Richardson. *Mama Don't Allow*, 1956.

Reisz, Karel. *We Are the Lambeth Boys*, 1956.

Reisz, Karel. *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, 1960.

Reisz, Karel. *Night Must Fall*, 1964.

Reisz, Karel. *Morgan, A Suitable Case for Treatment*, 1966.

Reisz, Karel. *Isadora*, 1968.

Reisz, Karel. *The Gambler*, 1974.

Reisz, Karel. *Who'll Stop the Rain*, 1978.

Renoir, Jean. *Boudu Saved From Drowning*, 1933.

Renoir, Jean. *La Bête Humaine*, 1938.

Renoir, Jean. *The Rules of the Game*, 1939.

Resnais, Alain. *Night and Fog*, 1955.

Resnais, Alain. *Hiroshima. Mon Amour*, 1959.

Resnais, Alain. *Last Year at Marienbad*, 1961.
 Resnais, Alain. *Muriel*, 1963.
 Resnais, Alain. *Je T'Aime, Je T'Aime*, 1968.
 Richardson, Tony. *Look Back in Anger*, 1959.
 Richardson, Tony. *The Entertainer*, 1960.
 Richardson, Tony. *Sanctuary*, 1961.
 Richardson, Tony. *A Taste of Honey*, 1961.
 Richardson, Tony. *The Loneliness of the Long Distance Runner*, 1962.
 Richardson, Tony. *Tom Jones*, 1963.
 Richardson, Tony. *The Loved One*, 1965.
 Richardson, Tony. *The Charge of the Light Brigade*, 1968.
 Ripplloh, Frank. *Taxi Zum Klo*, 1981.
 Rivette, Jacques. *L'Amour Fou*, 1967-9.
 Rivette, Jacques. *Céline and Julie Go Boating*, 1974.
 Roeg, Nicholas and Donald Cammell. *Performance*, 1970.
 Roeg, Nicholas. *Walkabout*, 1971.
 Roeg, Nicholas. *Don't Look Now*, 1973.
 Rossellini, Roberto. *Rome: Open City*, 1945.
 Rossellini, Roberto. *Paisan*, 1946.
 Rossellini, Roberto. *Germany, Year Zero*, 1947.
 Rossellini, Roberto. *Two Women*, 1961.
 Russell, Ken. *Amelia and the Angel*, 1958.
 Russell, Ken. *Elgar*, 1960.
 Russell, Ken. *French Dressing*, 1963.
 Russell, Ken. *Bartok*, 1964.
 Russell, Ken. *The Debussy Film*, 1965.
 Russell, Ken. *Isadora Duncan, The Biggest Dancer in the World*, 1966.
 Russell, Ken. *Dante's Inferno*, 1967.
 Russell, Ken. *Billion Dollar Brain*, 1967.
 Russell, Ken. *Delius: Song of Summer*, 1968.
 Russell, Ken. *Women in Love*, 1969.
 Russell, Ken. *The Dance of the Seven Veils*, 1970.
 Russell, Ken. *The Music Lovers*, 1970.
 Russell, Ken. *The Devils*, 1970.
 Russell, Ken. *The Boy Friend*, 1971.
 Russell, Ken. *Savage Messiah*, 1972.
 Russell, Ken. *Altered States*, 1980.
 Russell, Ken. *Crimes of Passion*, 1984.
 Russell, Ken. *The Fall of the Louse of Usher*, 2002.
 Ruttman, Walther. *Berlin: Symphony of a City*, 1927.
 Schertzing, Victor. *The Mikado*, 1939.
 Schlesinger, John. *Terminus*, 1961.
 Schlesinger, John. *A Kind of Loving*, 1962.
 Schlesinger, John. *Billy Liar*, 1963.
 Schlesinger, John. *Darling*, 1965.
 Schlesinger, John. *Far from the Madding Crowd*, 1967.
 Schlesinger, John. *Midnight Cowboy*, 1969.
 Schlöndorff, Volker. *The Tin Drum*, 1979.
 Scorsese, Martin. *Mean Streets*, 1973.

Scorsese, Martin. *Taxi Driver*, 1976.
 Sokurov, Alexandr. *Russian Ark*, 2003.
 Spielberg, Steven. *The Colour Purple*, 1985.
 Spielberg, Steven. *Empire of the Sun*, 1987.
 Spielberg, Steven. *Saving Private Ryan*, 1998.
 Syberberg Hans Jurgen. *Hitler: A Film From Germany*, 1977.
 Syberberg Hans Jurgen. *Parcifal*, 1982.
 Takeshi, Kitano. *Kikujiro*, 1999.
 Tarkovsky, Andrei. *Solaris*, 1973.
 Tarkovsky, Andrei. *Stalker*, 1979.
 Thomas, Ralph. *Above Us the Waves*, 1955.
 Thompson, J. Lee. *Yield to the Night*, 1956.
 Thompson, J. Lee. *Woman in a Dressing Gown*, 1957.
 Thompson, J. Lee. *Ice Cold in Alex*, 1958.
 Truffaut, François. *Les Mistons*, 1957.
 Truffaut, François. *The 400 Blows*, 1959.
 Truffaut, François. *Shoot the Piano Player*, 1960.
 Truffaut, François. *Jules et Jim*, 1961.
 Truffaut, François. *Fahrenheit 451*, 1966.
 Truffaut, François. *Day for Night*, 1973.
 Truffaut, François. *The Last Metro*, 1980.
 Van Sant, Gus. *Mala Noche*, 1985.
 Van Sant, Gus. *Gerry*, 2002.
 Varda, Agnes. *The Gleaners and I*, 2000.
 Vertov, Dziga. *The Man with a Movie Camera*, 1929.
 Vidor, King. *War and Peace*, 1956.
 Vigo, Jean. *À Propos de Nice*, 1933.
 Vigo, Jean. *Zero de Conduit*, 1933.
 Vigo, Jean. *L'Atalante*, 1934.
 Visconti, Luchino. *Ossessione*, 1942.
 Visconti, Luchino. *La Terra Trema*, 1947.
 Visconti, Luchino. *Rocco and his Brothers*, 1960.
 Visconti, Luchino. *The Leopard*, 1963.
 Visconti, Luchino. *Death in Venice*, 1971.
 Wadja, Andrzej. *Ashes and Diamonds*, 1958.
 Walters, Charles. *Easter Parade*, 1948.
 Warhol, Andy. *Sleep*, 1963.
 Watkins, Peter. *Culloden*, 1964.
 Watkins, Peter. *War Game*, 1965.
 Watt, Harry and Basil Wright. *Night Mail*, 1936.
 Wiene, Robert. *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari*, 1919.
 Welles, Orson. *Citizen Kane*, 1941.
 Welles, Orson. *The Magnificent Ambersons*, 1942.
 Welles, Orson. *Macbeth*, 1948.
 Welles, Orson. *Othello*, 1952.
 Welles, Orson. *Touch of Evil*, 1958.
 Welles, Orson. *The Trial*, 1962.
 Welles, Orson. *Chimes at Midnight*, 1966.
 Wenders, Wim. *Alice in the Cities*, 1974.

Wenders, Wim. *Kings of the Road*, 1976.
Wenders, Wim. *The American Friend*, 1977.
Wenders, Wim. *The State of Things*, 1982.
Wenders, Wim. *Paris, Texas*, 1984.
Wenders, Wim. *Wings of Desire*, 1987.
Whatham, Claude. *Sweet William*, 1979.
Wieland, Joyce. *Rat Life and Diet in America*, 1968.
Wollen, Peter and Laura Mulvey. *Penthesilea: The Queen of the Amazons*, 1974.

Secondary Sources.

- Abbot, Frank, 1999 (1983). 'The IFA: Film Club/Trade Association'. Dickinson, 168-70.
- Abel, Richard, 1988. *French Film Theory and Criticism: 1907-1929, vol 1*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Abrams, M.H., 1993. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Adair, Gilbert and Nick Roddick, 1985. *A Night at the Pictures: Ten Decades of the British Film*. London: Columbus/BFI Publishing.
- Adair, Gilbert, 1995. *Flickers*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Aitkin, Ian, 1990. *Film and Reform: John Grierson and the Documentary Film Movement*. London: Routledge.
- Aitkin, Ian, 2000. *Alberto Cavalcanti: Realism, Surrealism and National Cinema*. Trowbridge: Flick Books.
- Aitkin, Ian, 1997. 'The British Documentary Film Movement'. Murphy, 58-67.
- Alemany-Galway, Mary, 2001. 'Postmodernism and the French New Novel: The Influence of *Last Year at Marienbad* on *The Draughtsman's Contract*'. Willoquet-Maricondi and Alemany-Galway, 115-36.
- Algate, Anthony and Jeffrey Richards, 2002. *Best of British: Cinema and Society from 1930 to Present*. London: I.B. Taurus.
- Alison, Jane ed., 2001. *Colour After Klein: Re-Thinking Colour Within Modern and Contemporary Culture*. London: Black Dog Publishing.
- Almeryda, Michael. 1995. 'Notes on Derek Jarman'. Boorman and Donohue, 233-8.
- Anderson, Lindsay. 1996. 'Only Connect: Some Aspects of the Work of Humphrey Jennings'. O'Pray, 84-101.

- Andrew, Geoff, 1989. 'Terence Davies'. *The Film Handbook*. Harlow, Longman.
- Andrew, Geoff, 2002 (a) 'Belly of an Architect'. Pym, 90.
- Andrew, Geoff, 2002 (b). 'Britannia Hospital'. Pym, 142.
- Andrew, Geoff, 2002 (c) 'Distant Voices, Still Lives'. Pym, 299.
- Andrew, Geoff, 2002 (d) 'The House of Mirth'. Pym, 525.
- Andrew, Geoff, 2002 (e) 'The Long Day Closes'. Pym, 679-80.
- Andrew, Geoff, 2002 (f) 'A Matter of Life and Death'. Pym, 738-9.
- Andrew, Geoff, 2002 (g) 'Naked'. Pym, 799.
- Andrew, Geoff, 2002 (h) 'Prospero's Books'. Pym, 931.
- Andrew, Geoff, 2002 (i) 'The Red Shoes'. Pym, 965.
- Andrew, Geoff, 2002 (j) 'The Terence Davies Trilogy'. Pym, 1154-5.
- Andrew, Geoff, 2002 (k) 'Tommy'. Pym, 1190.
- Andrews, Nigel, 2000 (1971). 'A Walk Through Greenaway'. *Gras and Gras*, 3-5.
- Anonymous, 1983. 'The Gold Diggers'. *Variety*. 30/11/1983. 26.
- Armes, Roy, 1978. *A Critical History of British Cinema*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Armstrong, Richard, 2005. *Understanding Realism*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Arnheim, Rudolph, 1958. *Film as Art*. London: Faber.
- Ashby, Justine and Andrew Higson eds., 2000. *British Cinema: Past and Present*. London: Routledge.
- Ashby, Justine, 2001. 'The Angry Young Man is Tired: Albert Finney and 1960s British Cinema'. *British Stars and Stardom: From Alma Taylor to Sean Connery*. Ed., Bruce Babington. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Attile, Martine, Reese Auguiste, Peter Gidal and Isaac Julien, 1996. 'Aesthetics and Politics: Working on Two Fronts'. O'Pray, 261-74
- Auerbach, Erich, 1953 (2003 edition). *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Princeton: Princeton U.P.

- Auty, Chris, 2002 (a). 'Bad Timing'. Pym, 70.
- Auty, Chris, 2002 (b). 'The Falls'. Pym, 366.
- Auty, Chris, 2002 (c). 'Radio On'. Pym, 950.
- Auty, Martin and Nick Roddick eds., 1985. *British Cinema Now*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Bal, Mieke, 1985. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Balasz, Bela, 1952. *The Theory of the Film: Character and Growth of a New Art*. London: Denis Dobson.
- Balcon, Michael, 1943. *Realism or Tinsel: A Paper Delivered to the Workers' Film Association*. London: Workers' Film Association.
- Barr, Charles ed, 1986. *All Our Yesterdays: 90 Years of British Cinema*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Barsam, Richard M, 1992. *Non-Fiction Film: A Critical History*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- Barthes, Roland, 1977. 'Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives'. *Image, Music, Text*. London: Fontana. 79-117.
- Barthes, Roland, 1986. 'The Reality Effect'. *The Rustle of Language*. Berkeley: University of Southern California Press. 141-8.
- Bawden, Liz-Anne, 1976. *The Oxford Companion to Film*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Baxter, John, 1973. *Ken Russell: An Appalling Talent*. London: Joseph.
- Bayer, William, 1973. *The Great Movies*. New York: Hamlyn.
- Bazin, Andre, 2002. 'An Aesthetic of Reality'. Fowler, 56-63.
- Bazin, Andre, 2005 (a). *What is Cinema? Volume 1*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Bazin, Andre, 2005 (b). *What is Cinema? Volume 2*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Bennett, Tony et al, 1981. *Popular Film and Television*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Bergan, Ronald, 1992. *Jean Renoir - Projections of Paradise*. London: Bloomsbury.

- Bergman, Ingmar, 1994. *Images: My Life in Film*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Bersani, Leo and Ulysse Dutoit, 1999. *Caravaggio*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Blanchard, Simon and Sylvia Harvey, 1983. 'The Post-War Independent Cinema - Structure and Organisation'. Curran and Porter, 226-241.
- Bloch, Judy, 2000 (1991). 'Conversation with Mike Liegh and Alison Steadman'. Movshovitz , 16-25.
- Boorman, John and Walter Donohue eds., 1993. *Projections: A Forum For Filmmakers*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Boorman, John and Walter Donohue eds., 1995. *Projections 4½*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Boorman, John, 1995. 'Lee Marvin'. Boorman and Donohue, 23-27.
- Booth, W.C., 1961. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bordwell, David, 1985. *Narration in Fiction Film*. London: Methuen.
- Bordwell, David, 2002. 'The Art Cinema as a Mode of Film Practice'. Fowler. 95-102.
- Bordwell, David and Kristin Thompson eds., 2003. *Film Art: An Introduction, 7th Edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bragg, Melvyn, 1993. *The Seventh Seal*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Brakhage, Stan, 2001. *Essential Brakhage*. New York: Documentext.
- Branigan, Edward, 1984. *Point of View in the Cinema: A Theory of Narration and Subjectivity in Classical Film*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Branigan, Edward, 1992. *Narrative Comprehension and Film*. London: Routledge.
- Branigan, Edward, 1996. 'Story World and Screen'. *Narratology*. Eds.. Susan Onega and Jose Angel Garcia Landa. New York: Longman, 234-50.
- Braudy, Leo and Marshall Cohen, eds., 1999. *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Breakwell, Ian, 1995. *An Actor's Revenge*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Brokes, Emma, 2004. 'Maybe I'm Too Clever'. *The Guardian*. 5 (10): 5-7.
- Brown, Robert. 2000 (1981). 'Greenaway's Contract'. *Gras and Gras* . 6-12.

- Brown, Geoff, 2002. 'The Importance of Being Earnest'. Pym, 547.
- Brownlow, Kevin, 1996. *David Lean: A Biography*. Richard Cohen.
- Brunette, Peter, 2000 (1991). 'The Director's Improvised Reality'. Movshovitz, 30-4.
- Bryant, Marsha, 1997. *Auden and Documentary in the 1930s*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Buchholtz, Hartmut and Uwe Kuenzel, 2000 (1988). 'Two Things That Count: Sex and Death'. Gras and Gras, 50-9.
- Burt, George, 1994. *The Art of Film Music*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Canby, Vincent, 1979. 'Series at Modern is Presenting *Radio On*'. *The New York Times*. 4 (13): 49.
- Carney, Ray, 2001. *Cassavetes on Cassevetes*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Carr, Jay, 2000 (1994). '*Naked*: English Director Mike Leigh Turns his Uncompromising Vision on the Way Things Are'. Movshovitz, 55-8.
- Caughie, John, 1986. 'Broadcasting and Cinema 1: Converging Histories'. Barr, 189-205.
- Caughie, John, 1995 (a). 'The British Documentary Movement'. Vincendeau, 60.
- Caughie, John, 1995 (b). 'London Filmmakers Co-op'. Vincendeau, 266.
- Caughie, John and Kevin Rockett eds., 1996. *The Companion to British and Irish Cinema*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Caughie, John, 2000. *Television Drama: Realism, Modernism and British Culture*. London: Clarendon Press.
- Caute, David, 1994. *Joseph Losey: A Revenge on Life*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Chanan, Michael, 1996. 'The Treats of Trickery'. Williams, 117-122.
- Charity, Tom, 2001. *John Cassavetes: Lifeworks*. London: Omnibus Press.
- Charity, Tom, 2002 (a). 'Blue'. Pym, 123-4.
- Charity, Tom, 2002 (b). 'The Baby of Macon'. Pym, 123-4.
- Charity, Tom, 2002 (c). 'Career Girls'. Pym, 177.
- Charity, Tom, 2002 (d). 'Carla's Song'. in Pym, 178.

- Charity, Tom, 2002 (e). 'The Pillow Book'. Pym, 901.
- Charity, Tom, 2002 (f). 'Woman in a Dressing Gown'. Pym, 1304.
- Chibnall, Steve, 2000. *J. Lee Thompson*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Christie, Ian, 1978. *Powell, Pressburger and Others*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Christie, Ian, 1994. *Arrows of Desire: The Films of Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger*. London: Waterstone.
- Christie, Ian, 1997. 'Will Lottery Money Assure the British Film Industry? Or Should Chris Smith be Rediscovering the Virtues of State Intervention?'. *New Statesman*. 126: 20/6. 38-40.
- Christie, Ian, 1998. 'The Avant-Gardes and European Cinema Before 1930'. Hill and Church-Gibson, 449-54.
- Christie, Ian, 2000. 'As Others See Us: British Filmmaking and Europe in the 1990s'. Murphy, 68-79.
- Chua, Lawrence, 2000 (1997). 'Peter Greenaway: An Interview'. Gras and Gras, 176-185.
- Ciecko, Anne, 2002. 'Sally Potter: The Making of a British Woman Filmmaker'. *Fifty Contemporary Filmmakers*. Ed., Yvonne Tasker. London: Routledge: 272-9.
- Ciment, Michel, 2000 (1985). 'Interview with Peter Greenaway: *Zed and Two Noughts*'. Gras and Gras, 28-41.
- Ciment, Michel, 2000 (1993). 'Interview with Peter Greenaway: *The Baby of Macon*'. Gras and Gras, 154-65.
- Clayton, Sue And Jonathan Culing et al., 1981. 'The Song of the Shirt'. Stoneman and Thompson, 100-129.
- Clements, Paul, 1983. *The Improvised Play: The Work of Mike Leigh*. London: Methuen.
- Cocteau, Jean, 2003. *The Art of Cinema*. London: Marion Boyars.
- Coe, Jonathan, 1995. 'Jolly and Grim'. *Sight and Sound* 5 (10): 12-17.
- Combs, Richard, 1985. 'Ich Bin Ein Engländer: Or Show Me the Way to Go Home'. *Monthly Film Bulletin*. 52 (616), May. 136-9.
- Conrich, Ian, 1997. Traditions of the British Horror Film. Murphy. 226-234.
- Conveney, Michael, 1997. *The World According to Mike Leigh*. London: Harper

- Collins.
- Conveney, Michael, 2000 (1993). 'In a Class of his Own'. *Movshovitz*. 35-41.
- Cook, David, 2004. *A History of Narrative Film*. London: W.W. Norton.
- Costantini, Costanzo ed., 1994. *Fellini on Fellini*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Cottrell Boyce, Frank, 1997. *Welcome to Sarajevo*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Cox, Alex, 2003. 'Counterblast'. *Sight and Sound* 13 (1): 8. 6-7.
- Curnow, Wystan and Roger Horrocks, 1984. *Figures of Motion: Len Lye. Selected Writings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Curran, James and Vincent Porter eds., 1983. *British Cinema History*. London: Weidenfeld and Nelson.
- Curtis, David, 1971. *Experimental Cinema*. London: Studio Vista.
- Curtis, David, 1996. 'English Avant-Garde Film: An Early Chronology'. O'Pray, 103-122.
- Curtis-Fox, Terry, 1981. 'Radio On'. *Soho Weekly News*, reprinted in Stoneman and Thompson, 25.
- Dacre, Richard, 1997. 'Traditions of British Comedy'. Murphy, 198-206.
- Danek, Sabine and Torsten Bayer, 2000 (1994). 'Beyond Cinema'. Gras and Gras, 166-71.
- Danek, Sabine, 2000 (1999). 'Luggage Stories'. Gras and Gras, 190-3.
- Darke, Chris, 1995. 'Avant-Garde Cinema in Europe'. Vincendeau, 24-6.
- Davies, Stephen P., 2000. *Love Kills: The Making of Sid and Nancy*. Suffolk: Screen Press Books.
- Davies, Terence, 1984. *Hallelujah Now*. London: Brilliance Books.
- Davies, Terence, 1992. *A Modest Pageant*. London: Faber and Faber.
- DeJongh, Alfred, 1979. 'Chris Petit'. *The Guardian*. 12 (1): 13.
- Deleyto, Celestino, 1996. 'Focalisation in Narrative Film'. *Narratology*. Eds., Susan Onega and Jose Angel Garcia Landa. New York: Longman. 217-33
- Deren, Maya. 1999. 'Cinematography: The Creative Use of Reality'. Braudy and Cohen, 216-27.

- Diamond, Elin, 1997. *Unmaking Mimesis : Essays on Feminism and Theatre*. London: Routledge.
- Dibbets, Karel, 1996. 'The Introduction of Sound'. Nowell-Smith, 211-20.
- Dick, Eddie, Andrew Noble and Duncan Petrie eds., 1993. *Bill Douglas: A Lanternist's Account*. London: BFI Publishing
- Dickinson, Margaret ed., 1999. *Rouge Reels: Oppositional Film in Britain, 1945-90*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Dickson, Frances, 2002. 'The Gold Diggers'. Pym, 450.
- Dixon, Wheeler W. ed., 1994. *Re-Viewing British Cinema 1900-1992*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dixon, Wheeler W., 1994. 'The Long Day Closes: An Interview with Terence Davies'. Dixon, 249-60.
- Dixon, Wheeler W., 1997. *The Exploding Eye: A Re-Visionary History of 1960s American Experimental Cinema*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dixon, Wheeler W. and Gwendolyn Audrey Foster eds., 2002. *Experimental Cinema, The Film Reader*. London, Routledge.
- Donald, James, Anna Friedberg and Laura Marcus eds., 1998. *Close Up 1927-1933 Cinema and Modernism*. London: Cassell.
- Downing, Taylor, 1992. *Olympia*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Drabble, Margaret and Jenny Stringer eds, 1987. *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Driscoll, Lawrence, 1996. "'The Rose Revived'" Derek Jarman and the British Tradition'. Lippard, 65-83.
- Duncan, Dean, 2002. 'Fires Were Started: The War-Time Films Of Humphrey Jennings'. New York: Image Entertainment.
- Durgnat, Raymond, 1970. *A Mirror for England: British Movies From Austerity to Affluence*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Durgnat, Raymond, 1972. *Sexual Alienation in the Cinema*. London: Studio Vista.
- Dusinberre, Deke, 1996. 'The Avant-Garde Attitude in the Thirties'. O'Pray 65-83.
- Dwoskin, Steve, 1975. *Film Is: International Free Cinema*. London: Peter Owen.

- Dwoskin, Steve, et al., 1999 (1974). 'Letter'. Dickinson, 125.
- Dyer, Richard, 1990. *Now You See It: Studies on Lesbian and Gay Film*. London: Routledge.
- Ebert, Jack and Terry Ilott, 1990. *My Indecision is Final: The Rise and Fall of Goldcrest Films*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Eisner, Lotte, 1974. *The Haunted Screen: Expressionism in the German Cinema and the Influence of Max Reinhardt*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Ellickson, Lee and Richard Porton, 2000 (1994). 'I Find the Tragicomic Things in Life: An Interview with Mike Leigh'. *Movshovitz*, 59-78.
- Elliot, Bridget and Anthony Purdy, 1997. *Peter Greenaway: Architecture and Allegory*. Chichester: Academy Editions.
- Ellis, John ed., 1977. *British Film Institute Productions 1951-76: Catalogue*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Ellis, John, 1999 (1980). 'The Independent Filmmaker's Association and the Fourth Channel'. Dickinson, 158-9.
- Ellis, Jack, 2000. *John Grierson: Life, Contributions, Influence*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Ellis, Jack and Betsy McLane, 2005. *A New History of Documentary Film*. London: Continuum.
- Ellis, Jim, 1997. 'Strange Meeting: Wilfred Owen, Benjamin Britten, Derek Jarman and *The War Requiem*'. *The Work of Opera: Genre, Nationhood and Sexual Difference*. Eds. Richard Dellamora and Daniel Fischlin. New York: Columbia University Press. 277-96.
- Ellis, Jim, 1999. 'Queer Period: Derek Jarman's Renaissance'. *Outtakes: Essays On Queer Theory and Film*. Ed. Ellis Hanson. Durham: Duke University Press. 228-315.
- Elsaesser, Thomas, 1993. 'Images for Sale: The "New" British Cinema'. Friedman. 52-69.
- Elsaesser, Thomas, 1996. 'Peter Greenaway'. *Spellbound: Art and Film*. London: Hayward Gallerey and BFI Publishing.
- Evans, Peter William, 2005. *Carol Reed*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Everett, Wendy, 2004. *Terence Davies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Falsetto, Mario, 1999. *Personal Vision: Conversations with Independent Filmmakers*.

London: Constable.

Farley, Fidelma, 2002. 'Neil Jordan'. *Fifty Contemporary Filmmakers*. Ed., Yvonne Tasker. London: Routledge. 186-194.

Field, Simon, 1981. 'Comment on *The Falls*'. Stoneman and Thompson. 49-51.

Figgis, Mike, 1999. *The Loss of Sexual Innocence*. London: Faber and Faber.

Fowler, Catherine ed., 2002. *The European Cinema Reader*. London: Routledge.

Fox, Ken and Maitland McDonagh, eds., 1999. *The Virgin Film Guide*. London: Virgin Books.

Franklin, Peter, 1991. *Mahler: Symphony No. 3*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

French, Philip, 1979. 'Radio On'. *The Observer*. 11 (25): 17.

Friedman, Lester ed., 1993. *Fires Were Started: British Cinema and Thatcherism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Friedman, Lester, 1993. 'The Empire Strikes Out: An American Perspective of the British Film Industry'. Friedman, 1-14.

Friedman, Lester and Scott Stewart, 1994 (a). 'The Tradition of independence: An Interview with Lindsay Anderson'. Dixon, 165-76.

Friedman, Lester and Scott Stewart, 1994 (b). 'Keeping His Own Voice: An Interview with Stephen Frears'. Dixon, 221-40.

Fuller, Graham ed., 1994. *Potter on Potter*. London: Faber and Faber.

Fuller, Graham ed., 1998. *Loach on Loach*. London: Faber and Faber.

Gardener, Colin, 2004. *Joseph Losey*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Garner, David, 1996. 'Perverse Law: Jarman as Gay Criminal Hero'. Lippard, 31-64.

Genette, Gerard, 1980. *Narrative Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Geraghty, Christine, 1997. 'Women and Sixties British Cinema: The Development of the 'Darling' Girl'. Murphy, 154-66.

Gibson, Ben, 1984. 'Death and Transfiguration'. *Monthly Film Bulletin*, 51 (609). 321.

Gidal, Peter, 1977. *Structural Film Anthology*. London: BFI Publishing.

- Gidal, Peter, 1989. *Materialist Film*. London: Routledge.
- Gidal, Peter, 1996. 'Theory and Definition of Structuralist/Materialist Film'. O'Pray, 144-59.
- Giles, Jane, 1997. *The Crying Game*. London: BFI.
- Gleick, James, 1987. *Chaos*. London: Abacus.
- Goldman, William, 1996. *Adventures in the screen trade : a Personal View of Hollywood and Screen Writing*. London : Abacus.
- Gomez, Joseph, 1976. *Ken Russell: The Adaptor and Creator*. London: Muller.
- Gore-Langton, Robert, 2000 (1988). 'The Leigh Way'. Movshovitz , 13-15.
- Graf, Alexander, 2002. *The Cinema of Wim Wenders: The Celluloid Highway*. London: Wallflower.
- Gras, Vernon and Marguerite Gras eds., 2000. *Peter Greenaway Interviews*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press.
- Greenaway, Peter, 1986. *A Zed & Two Noughts*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Greenaway, Peter, 1993 (a) *The Falls*. Paris: Dis Voir.
- Greenaway, Peter, 1993 (b) *The Baby of Maçon*. Paris: Dis Voir.
- Greenaway, Peter, 1993 (c) *The Audience of Maçon*. Cardiff: Ffotogallery.
- Greenaway, Peter, 1996 (a) *Fear of Drowning By Numbers*. Paris: Dis Voir.
- Greenaway, Peter, 1996 (b) *The Pillow Book*. Paris: Dis Voir.
- Greenaway, Peter, 2001. 'Body and Text: *Eight and a Half Women*: A Laconic Black Comedy'. Willoquet-Maricondi and Alemany-Galway, 285-299.
- Griffin, Gabriele, 2000. *Representations of HIV and AIDS: Visibility Blue/s*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hacker, Jonathan and David Price, 1991. *Take Ten: British Film Directors*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hallam, Julie, 2000. *Realism and Popular Culture*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hamlyn, Nicky, 1996. 'Structuralist Traces'. O'Pray, 219-38.
- Hamlyn, Nicky, 2003. *Film Art Phenomena*. London: BFI Publishing.

- Hammond, Paul, 1997. *L'Âge D'Or*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Harbord, Janet, 2002. *Film Cultures*. London: SAGE publication.
- Harper, Sue and Vincent Porter, 2003. *British Cinema of the 1950s: Decline and Deference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, Sylvia, 1986. '“The Other Cinema” in Britain: Unfinished Business in Oppositional and Independent Film, 1929-84.’ *Barr* 225-51.
- Hawks, David, 1996. ‘“The Shadow of this Time” The Renaissance Cinema of Derek Jarman’. *Lippard*, 103-16.
- Hayman, Ronald, 1984. *Fassbinder: Filmmaker*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Hayward, Anthony, 2004. *Which Side Are You On? Ken Loach and His Films*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Hedling, Erik, 1997. ‘Lindsay Anderson and the Development of British Art Cinema’. *Murphy*, 178-86.
- Hedling, Erik, 1998. *Lindsay Anderson: Maverick Filmmaker*. Cassell: London.
- Hedling, Erik, 2003. ‘Sequence: Lindsay Anderson and the Rise of Auteurism in 1950s Britain’. *MacKillop and Sinyard*, 23-31.
- Higson, Andrew, 1986. ‘“Britain’s Outstanding Contribution to the Film: The Documentart-Realist Tradition’’. *Barr*, 72-97.
- Higson, Andrew, 1995. *Waving the Flag: Constructing a National Cinema in Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Higson, Andrew, ed., 1996. *Dissolving Views: Key Writings on British Cinema*. London: Cassell.
- Higson, Andrew, 1996. ‘The Heritage Film and British Cinema’. *Higson*, 232-248.
- Higson, Andrew, 1998. ‘British Cinema’. *Hill and Church-Gibson*, 501-9.
- Higson, Andrew, 2002. ‘The Concept of National Cinema’. *The European Cinema Reader*. Ed. Catherine Fowler. London: Routledge.
- Higson, Andrew, 2003. *English Heritage. English Cinema*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Hill, John, 1986. *Sex, Class and Realism: British Cinema 1956-63*. London: BFI Publishing.

- Hill, John, 1992. 'The Issue of National Cinema and British Film Production'. Petrie, 10-21.
- Hill, John, 1997. 'British Cinema as National Cinema: Production, Audience and Representation'. Murphy, 244-54.
- Hill, John, 1999. *British Cinema in the 1980s*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hill, John, 2000 (a). 'The Rise and Fall of British Art Cinema: A Short History of the 1980s and 1990s'. *Aura* 6:3. 18-32.
- Hill, John, 2000 (b). 'Failure and Utopianism: Representations of the Working Class in British Cinema 1990s'. Murphy (2000), 178-87.
- Hill, John, 2000 (c). 'From New Wave to "Brit Grit": Continuity and Difference in Working Class Realism'. Ashby and Higson, 249-60.
- Hill, John and Pamela Church-Gibson eds., 1998. *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, John and Martin McLoone eds., 1996. *Big Picture, Small Screen: The Relations Between Film and Television*. Luton: University of Luton Press.
- Holden, Anthony, 1988. *Olivier*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Holden, Anthony, 1993. *The Oscars: The Secret History of the Academy Awards*. London: Little Brown and Company.
- Hood, Stuart, 1983. 'John Grierson and the British Documentary Film Movement'. Curran and Porter, 99-112.
- Horne, William, 1999. "'Greatest Pleasures': *A Taste of Honey* and *The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner*'. Welsh and Tibbetts, 81-126.
- Horrocks, Roger, 2002. *Len Lye: A Biography*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Hotchkiss, Lisa M., 2001. 'Theatre, Ritual and Materiality in Peter Greenaway's *The Baby of Maçon*'. Willoquet-Maricondi and Alemany-Galway, 223-254.
- Hoyle, Brian, 2005. 'Intertextuality and Film: Sally Potter's *Orlando*'. *European Intertexts: Women's Writing in English in a European Context*. Eds. Patsy Stoneman & Ana-Maria Sanchez Arce. Brussels: Peter Lang. 190-214.
- Humm, Maggie, 1997. *Feminism and Film*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Humm, Maggie, 1998. 'The Business of a "New Art": Woolf, Potter and Postmodernism'. *Writing: A Woman's Business*. Eds. Judy Simons and Kate Fullbrook. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 111-125.

- Hunt, Martin, 1999. 'The Poetry of the Ordinary: Terence Davies and the Social Art Cinema'. *Screen*. Vol 40 issue 1 pages 1-16.
- IFA Conference Organising Committee, 1999 (1976). 'Independent Filmmaking in the 70s'. Dickinson, 126-35.
- IFA, 1999 (1980). 'Channel Four: Innovation or ITV2?'. Dickinson, 160-1.
- Indiana, Gary, 2000. *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Issari, M Ali, 1979. *What is Cinema Verite?* London: Scarecrow Press.
- James, Nick, 2003 (1) 'Modern Times'. *Sight and Sound* 12 (12): 20-3.
- James, Nick, 2003 (2) 'Keeping It Clean'. *Sight and Sound* 13 (3): 16-17.
- Jarman, Derek, 1984. *Dancing Ledge*. London: Quartet Books.
- Jarman, Derek, 1986. *Caravaggio*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Jarman, Derek, 1987. *The Last of England*. London: Constable and Company Ltd.
- Jarman, Derek, 1989. *War Requiem: The Film*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Jarman, Derek, 1991. *Queer Edward II*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Jarman, Derek, 1992. *Modern Nature*. London: Vintage.
- Jarman, Derek, 1993. *At Your Own Risk: A Saint's Testament*. London: Vintage.
- Jarman, Derek and Terry Eagleton, 1993. *Wittgenstein: The Terry Eagleton Script/The Derek Jarman Film*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Jarman, Derek, 1995. *Chroma*. London: Vintage.
- Jarman, Derek, 2000. *Smiling in Slow Motion*. London: Century.
- Jenkins, Steve, 1982. 'An Unsuitable Job for a Woman'. *Monthly Film Bulletin*. 49 (580), March, 93.
- Jenkins, Steve, 1984. 'Flight to Berlin'. *Monthly Film Bulletin*. 51 (602), March, 67-8.
- Jenkins, Steve, 1985. 'Chinese Boxes'. *Monthly Film Bulletin*. 52 (616), May, 135-6.
- Johnson, Trevor. 'Topsy-Turvy'. Pym 1193-4.
- Jones, Jonathan, 2000 (1998). 'It's So Hard to Be Humble. But I Try'. Gras and Gras, 186-89.

- Jordan, Marion, 1983. 'Carry On...Follow that Sterotype'. Curran and Porter. 312-27.
- Jordan, Neil, 1988. *Angel*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Julien, Isaac and Colin McCabe, 1991. *Diary of a Young Soul Rebel*. London: BFI.
- Kael, Pauline, 1994. *Going Steady: Film Writing 1968-69*. New York and London: Marion Boyars.
- Katz, Ephraim, 1998. *The Macmillan International Film Encyclopaedia*. London: Macmillan.
- Kelly, Mary, 1999 (1974). 'Penthesilia'. Dickinson, 146-8.
- Kennedy, A.L., 1997. *The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Kermode, Mark, 2002. 'Raising Hell'. *Sight and Sound* 12 (12): 28-31.
- Klib, Andreas, 2000 (1989). 'I am the Cook: A Conversation with Peter Greenaway'. Gras and Gras, 60-5.
- Kinder, and Houston, 1972. *Close Up: A Critical Perspective on Film*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jonanovich Inc.
- Knowlson, James, 1996. *Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Konigsberg, Ira, 1993. *The Complete Film Dictionary*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Kozloff, Sarah, 1988. *Invisible Storytellers: Voice-over Narration in American Fiction Film*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Kracauer, Siegfried, 1960. *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Kracauer, Siegfried, 2004. *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kuhn, Annette, 2002. *Family Secrets: Acts of Memory and Imagination*. London: Verso.
- Lacey, Catherine, 1996. 'The Poetry of Fact'. O'Pray, 275-84.
- Landis, Bill, 1995. *Anger: The Unauthorised Biography of Kenneth Anger*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Lant, Antonia, 1993. 'Women's Independent Cinema: The Case of Leeds Animation Workshop'. Friedman, 161-187.

- Lanza, 1989. *Fragile Geometry: The Films, Philosophy and Misadventures of Nicolas Roeg*. New York: PAJ Publications.
- Lawrenson, Mark, 2005. 'Mike Leigh: The Vera Drake Interview'. *Sight and Sound* 15 (3). 12-15.
- Lawrenson, Edward, 2006. 'The Crying of the Wind'. *Sight and Sound* 16 (7). 45-6.
- Lay, Samatha, 2002. *British Social Realism: From Documentary to Brit Grit*. London, Wallflower Press.
- Lazar, David, ed., 2003. *Michael Powell Interviews*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press.
- Leach, Jim, 1993. 'Everyone's America Now: Nicholas Roeg in the 1980s'. Friedman, 203-17.
- Le Grice, Malcolm, 1976. *Abstract Film and Beyond*. London: Studio Vista.
- Le Grice, Malcolm, 1999 (1986). 'Reflections on the History of the London Filmmaker's Co-op'. Dickinson, 106-8.
- Le Grice, Malcolm, 2001. *Experimental Cinema in the Digital Age*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Leggett, Mike, 1981. 'The London Film-Maker's Co-op'. Stoneman and Thompson, 142-3.
- Leigh, Jacob, 2002. *The Cinema of Ken Loach: Art in the Service of the People*. London: Wallflower.
- Leigh, Mike, 1994. *Naked and Other Screenplays*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Leigh, Mike, 1995. 'L'Albero degli Zoccoli'. Boorman and Donohue, 113-17.
- Lippard, Chris, ed., 1996. *By Angels Driven: The Films of Derek Jarman*. Trowbridge: Flick Books.
- Lloyd, Ann, 1988. *The History of the Movies*. London: Macdonald and Co.
- London Women's Film Group, The, 1999 (1976). 'Notes'. Dickinson 119-22.
- Long, Robert Emmet, 1997. *The Films of Merchant Ivory*. New York : Harry N. Abrams, Inc.
- Long, Robert Emmet, 2005. *James Ivory in Conversation: How Merchant Ivory Makes its Films*. Berkley: University of California Press.

- Lovell, Alan, 1969. 'British Cinema: The Unknown Cinema'. Mimeo. The British Film Institute.
- Lovell, Alan, 1997. 'The British Cinema: The Known Cinema?'. Murphy, 235-43.
- Lovell, Alan and Jim Hillier, 1972. *Studies in Documentary*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Lowenstein, Adam, 2000. 'Under the Skin Horrors: Social Realism and Classlessness in *Peeping Tom* and the British New Wave'. Ashby and Higson, 221-32.
- MacCabe, Colin, 1981. 'Realism and the Cinema: Notes on some Brechtian Theses'. *Popular Television and Film*. Eds. Tony Bennett et al.. London: Open University Press. 216-35.
- MacCabe, Colin, 1996. 'A Post-national European Cinema: A Consideration of Derek Jarman's *The Tempest* and *Edward II*'. Higson, 191-201.
- MacCabe, Colin, 1998. *Performance*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Macdonald, Kevin, 1996. *Emeric Pressburger*. London: Faber.
- Macdonald, Kevin and Mark Cousins, 1998. *Imagining reality: The Faber Book of Documentary*. London: Faber.
- MacDonald, Scott, 1992. *A Critical Cinema 2: Interviews with Independent Filmmakers*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- MacDonald, Scott, 1993. *Avant-Garde Film*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackay, James, 1992. 'Low-Budget British Production: A Producer's Account'. Petrie: 52-64.
- MacKillop, Ian and Neil Sinyard eds., 2003. *British Cinema of the 1950s: A Celebration*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Macnab, Geoffry, 1993. 'Stealing Beauty'. *Sight and Sound* 13 (1): 24-6.
- McElhaney, Joe, 1996. 'Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger'. Nowell-Smith. 368-9.
- McFarlane, Brian, 1986. 'A Literary Cinema: British Films and British Novels'. Barr. 120-42.
- McFarlane, Brian, 1996. *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- McKee, Francis, 2003. 'The White Stuff'. *Sight and Sound* 13 (12): 20-3.

- McKnight, George, ed., 1997. *Agent of Challenge and Defiance: The Films of Ken Loach*. Trowbridge, Flick Books.
- McLoone, Martin, 1996. 'Boxed In? The aesthetics of film and television'. Eds. John Hill and Martin McLoone. University of Luton Press: Luton, 76-106.
- Malcolm, Derek, 2000. *A Century of Films*. London: Tauris Parke.
- Malik, Sarita, 1996. "'Beyond the Cinema of Duty'? The Pleasures of Hybridity: Black British Films of the 1980s and 1990s'. Higson, 202-215
- Marks, Leo, 1998. *Peeping Tom*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Marks, Martin, 1996 (a). 'Music and the Silent Film'. Nowell-Smith, 183-192.
- Marks, Martin, 1996 (b). 'The Sound of Music'. Nowell-Smith, 248-59.
- Mast, Gerald, 1981. *A Short History of the Movies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matthews, Peter, 2001. 'This Filthy Earth'. *Sight and Sound* 11 (12): 59.
- Medhurst, Andy, 1992. 'Carry On Camp'. *Sight and Sound* 12 (9) 13-15.
- Medhurst, Andy, 1993. 'Mike Leigh: Beyond Embarrassment'. *Sight and Sound* 13 (11): 7-11.
- Melia, Paul and Alan Woods eds., 1998. *Peter Greenaway: Artworks 63-98*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Miller, Toby, 2000. 'The Film Industry and the Government: 'Endless Mr. Beans and Mr. Bonds''. Murphy, 37-47.
- Mitry, Jean, 1998. *The Aesthetics and Psychology of the Cinema*. London: Athlone Press.
- Montagu, Ivor, 1964. *Film World: A Guide to The Cinema*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Morgan, Stuart, 2000 (1983). 'Breaking the Contract'. Gras and Gras, 13-20.
- Movshovitz, Howie ed., 2000. *Mike Leigh Interviews*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press.
- Movshovitz, Howie, 2000 (1994). 'Mike Leigh's Grim Optimism'. Movshovitz, 50-54.
- Mulvey, Laura, 1981. 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema'. Bennett et al, 206-15.
- Mulvey, Laura, 1996. 'Film Feminism and the Avant-Garde'. O'Pray, 199-218.
- Murphy, Robert, 1986. 'Under the Shadow of Hollywood'. Barr, 47-71.

- Murphy, Robert, 1989. *Realism and Tinsel*. London: Routledge.
- Murphy, Robert, 1997. *The British Cinema Book*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Murphy, Robert, 1997. 'Conclusion: A Short History of British Cinema'. Murphy, 255-64.
- Murphy, Robert, 2000. *British Cinema in the 1990s*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Murphy, Robert, 2000. 'A Path Through the Moral Maze. Murphy, 1-16.
- Murray, Peter and Linda Murray, 1972. *A Dictionary of Art and Artists*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Neale, Steve, 1981. 'Art Cinema and the Question of Independent Film'. Stoneman and Thompson, 41-45.
- Neale, Steve, 2000. *Genre and Hollywood*. London: Routledge.
- Neale, Steve, 2002. 'Art Cinema as Institution'. Fowler, 102-109.
- Nelmes, Jill, ed., 1996. *An Introduction to Film Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Nichols, Bill ed., 2001. *Maya Deren and the American Avant-Garde*. Berkely: University of California Press.
- Norman, Barry, 1992. *The 100 Best Films of the Century*. London: Chapman's Publishers.
- Nowell-Smith, Geoffrey, 1979. 'Radio On'. *Screen* 20(3/4): 29-39.
- Nowell-Smith, 1986. 'Humphrey Jennings: Surrealist Observer'. Barr, 321-33.
- Nowell-Smith, Geoffrey ed., 1996. *The Oxford History of World Cinema*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nowell-Smith, Geoffrey, 1996. 'Art Cinema'. Nowell-Smith, 567-75.
- Olivier, Laurence, 1994. *Confessions of an Actor: The Autobiography*. London: Orion.
- Onega, Susan and Jose Angel Garcia Landa, 1996. *Narratology*. New York: Longman.
- O'Neil, Eithne, 1994. *Stephen Frears*. Paris: Riveages.
- O'Pray, Michael, 1996 (a). *Derek Jarman: Dreams of England*. London: BFI Publishing.

- O'Pray, Michael, ed., 1996 (b). *The British Avant-Garde Film 1926 to 1995*. Luton, University of Luton Press.
- O'Pray, Michael, 1996 (c). 'The British Avant-Garde and Art Cinema from the 1970s to the 1990s'. Higson, 178-90.
- O'Pray, Michael, 1996 (d). 'The Art of Films/Films of Art'. *Derek Jarman: A Portrait*. Ed. Roger Wollen. London: Thames and Hudson, 65-76.
- O'Pray, Michael, 2003. *Avant-Garde Film: Forms, Themes and Passions*. London: Wallflower.
- Orr, John, 1993. *Cinema and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Orr, John, 1998. *Contemporary Cinema*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh U.P.
- Orr, John, 2000 (a). *The Art and Politics of Film*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh U.P.
- Orr, John, 2000 (b). 'The Art of National Identity: Peter Greenaway and Derek Jarman'. Ashby and Higson, 327-338.
- Ostwald, Michael, 2001. 'Rising from the Ruins: Interpreting the Missing Formal Device within *The Belly of an Architect*'. Willoquet-Maricondi and Alemany-Galway, 137-158.
- Ouditt, Sharon, 1999. 'Orlando: Coming Across the Divide'. *Adaptations*. Eds. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. London: Routledge.
- Pally, Marcia, 2000 (1991). 'Cinema as Total Art Form: An Interview with Peter Greenaway'. Gras and Gras, 106-19.
- Park, James, 1984. *Learning to Dream*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Park, James, 1990. *British Cinema: The Lights that Failed*. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd.
- Pascoe, David, 1997. *Peter Greenaway: Museums and Moving Images*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Peake, Tony, 1999. *Derek Jarman*. London: Little, Brown and Company.
- Pears, David, 1971. *Wittgenstein*. Glasgow: Fontana/Collins.
- Petit, Chris, 1981. 'Comment on *Radio On*'. Stoneman and Thompson, 20.
- Petit, Chris, Richard Combs and Steve Jenkins, 1984. 'Running Away and Travelling Ahead: Or, Leaving the British Cinema Behind'. *Monthly Film Bulletin*. 51 (602), March, 68-70.

- Petit, Chris, 2002 (a). 'Get Carter'. Pym, 435-6.
- Petit, Chris, 2002 (b). 'Point Blank'. Pym, 910.
- Petrakis, John, 2000 (1997). 'Blasphemy in Cinema: An Interview with Peter Greenaway'. *Gras and Gras*, 172-5.
- Petrie, Duncan, 1990. 'Precis'. *The Garden Press Book*. Artificial Eye. Unnumbered.
- Petrie, Duncan, 1991. *Creativity and Constraint in the British Film Industry*. London: Macmillan.
- Petrie, Duncan, ed., 1992. *New Questions of British Cinema*.
- Petrie, Duncan, 1996. 'British Cinema: The Search for Identity'. *The Oxford History of World Cinema*. Nowell-Smith, 604-613.
- Petrie, Duncan, 2000. *Screening Scotland*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Petrie, Duncan, 2002. 'Jubilee'. Pym, 596.
- Petrolle, Gean, 2001. 'Z is for Zebra, Zoo, Zed and Zygote, or Is It Possible to Live with Ambivalence'. *Willoquet-Maricondi and Alemany-Galway*, 159-76.
- Phillips, Gene, 1999. 'Novelist Versus Filmmaker: Richardson's Adaptations of Faulkner's *Sanctuary* and Waugh's *The Loved One*'. *Welsh and Tibbetts*, 127-140.
- Pines, Jim, 1997. 'British Cinema and Black Representation'. *Murphy*, 207-16.
- Pines, Jim, 1999 (1971). 'Black Films in White Britain'. *Dickinson*, 116-8
- Pinfold, Michael J., 1998. 'The Performance of Queer Masculinity in Derek Jarman's *Sebastiane*'. *Film Criticism*. 23: 1. 74-83
- Piszkiewicz, Dennis, 1998. *Wernher Von Braun: The Man Who Sold the Moon*. New York: Praeger.
- Porter, Vincent, 1985. *On Cinema*. London: Pluto Press.
- Porton, Richard, 1996. 'Language Games and Aesthetic Attitudes: Style and Ideology in Jarman's Late Films'. *Lippard*, 135-60.
- Potter, Sally, 1994. *Orlando*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Potter, Sally, 1997. *The Tango Lesson*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Potter, Sally, 2000. *The Man Who Cried*. London: Faber and Faber.

- Powell, Michael, 2000. *A Life in Movies*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Powell, Michael, 1990. *Million Dollar Movie*. New York: William Heinmann.
- Prince, Gerald, 1982. *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative*. Berlin: Mouton Publishers.
- Pummell, Simon, 1996. 'Will the Monster Eat the Film? Or the Redefinition of British Animation 1980-1994'. O'Pray, 299-315.
- Pym, John, 1979. 'Radio On'. *Monthly Film Bulletin*. 46 (550), Nov., 233-4.
- Pym, John, 1992. *Film on Four: A Survey*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Pym, John, 1995. *The Wandering Company: Twenty-One Years of Merchant-Ivory Films*. New York: Museum of Modern Art.
- Pym, John ed., 2002. *The Time Out Film Guide*. London: Penguin.
- Quart, Leonard, 1993. 'The Religion of the Market Place: Thatcherite Politics and the British Film of the 1980s'. Friedman, 15-43
- Quart, Leonard, 1994. 'The Politics of Irony: The Frears-Kureishi Films'. Dixon, 241-8.
- Quinn-Meyler, Martin, 1996. 'Opposing "Heterosoc": Jarman's Counter-hegemonic Activism'. Lippard, 117-34.
- Ranvaud, Don, 2000 (1987). 'The Belly of an Architect: Peter Greenaway Interviewed'. Gras and Gras, 42-9.
- Rattigan, Neil, 1994. 'The Last Gasp of the Middle Class: British War Films of the 1950s'. Dixon, 143-54.
- Rattigan, Neil, 2001. *This is England: British Film and the People's War*. London: Associated University Press.
- Rayns, Tony 1990. 'The "I-Movie"'. *The Garden Press Book*. Artificial Eye. Unnumbered.
- Rayns, Tony, 2002 (a). 'Anger's Magick Lantern Cycle'. Pym, 39.
- Rayns, Tony, 2002 (b). 'The Garden'. Pym, 429.
- Rayns, Tony, 2002 (c). 'Peeping Tom'. Pym, 888.
- Rayns, Tony, 2002 (d). 'Le Quai des Brumes'. Pym, 941.

- Rayns, Tony, 2002 (e). 'The Red Shoes'. Pym, 914.
- Rayns, Tony, 2002 (f). 'A Walk Through H'. Pym, 1263.
- Rees, A.L., 1996. 'Avand-Garde Film: The Second Wave'. Nowell-Smith, 537-550.
- Rees, A.L., 1999. *A History of Experimental Film and Video*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Reinert, Cristina, 2001. 'The Noe-Baroque Imaging of Peter Greenaway's Cinema'. Willoquet-Maricondi and Alemany-Galway, 51-78.
- Renan, Sheldon, 1967. *The Underground Film*. London: Studio Vista.
- Rich, B. Ruby, 1992 (a). *Chick Flicks: Theories and Memories of the Feminist Film Movement*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Rich, B. Ruby, 1992 (b). 'New Queer Cinema'. *Sight and Sound* 3 (9): 18-22.
- Rich, B. Ruby, 2000. 'Queer and Present Danger'. *Sight and Sound* 10 (3): 22-5.
- Richards, Jeffery, 1997. *Films and British National Identity: From Dickens to Dad's Army*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith, 1983. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London: Routledge.
- Robb, Peter, 1998. *M*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Robertson, Patrick, 1988. *Movie Facts and Feats*. Dublin: Abbeville Press.
- Robinson, David, 1997. *Das Kabinet des Dr. Caligari*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Rockett, Kevin and Emer Rockett, 2003. *Neil Jordan: Exploring Boundaries*. Dublin: Liffey Press.
- Rodgers, Marlene, 2000 (1991). *Prospero's Books - Word and Spectacle: An Interview with Peter Greenaway*. Gras and Gras, 135-47.
- Rodman, Howard A., 2000 (1991). 'Anatomy of a Wizard'. Gras and Gras, 120-8.
- Rohdie, Sam, 1995. *The Passion of Pier Paolo Pasolini*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Rotha, Paul, 1952. *Documentary Film*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Russell, Ken, 1993. *Fire Over England*. London: Random House.
- Sainsbury, Peter, 1977. 'Independent British Filmmaking and the Production Board'. Ellis, 40-2.

- Sainsbury, Peter, 1981. 'The Production Board'. Stoneman and Thompson. 9-11.
- Salles Gomes, P.E., 1998. *Jean Vigo*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Sanderson, Mark, 1996. *Don't Look Now*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Sanjek, David, 1994. 'Twilight of the Monsters: English Horror Films 1968-1975'. Dixon, 195-210.
- Sargeant, Amy, 2000. 'Making and Seeing Heritage Culture: Style and Authenticity in Historical Fictions on Film and Television'. Ashby and Higson, 301-15.
- Sarris, Andrew, 1995. 'Notes on the Auteur Theory, 1966'. Braudy and Cohen, 510-18.
- Shatz, Thomas, 1981. *Hollywood Genres: Formulas, Filmmaking and the Studio System*. New York: Random House.
- Shellard, Dominic, 2003. 'Adaptable Terrence Rattigan: Separate Tables, Separate Entities?'. MacKillop and Sinyard, 190-201
- Shipman, David, 1994. *Cinema: The First Hundred Years*. London: Phoenix.
- Shivas, Mark, 1996. 'Little Big Screen'. Williams (1996), 184-189.
- Silberman, Marc, ed., 2001. *Bertolt Brecht On Film and Radio*. London: Methuen.
- Siegel, Joel, 2000 (1990). 'Greenaway by Numbers'. Gras and Gras, 66-90.
- Silver, Alain and James Ursini eds., 2004. *Film Noir Reader*. New York: Limelight.
- Simons, Judy and Kate Fullbrook, 1998. *Writing: A Woman's Business*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Sinclair, Iain, 2002. 'Heartsnatch Hotel'. *Sight and Sound* 12 (12): 32-4.
- Sinker, Mark, 2004. *If....*. London: BFI Publications.
- Sinyard, Neil, 1991. *The Films of Nicolas Roeg*. London: Charles Letts.
- Sinyard, Neil, 2000. *Jack Clayton*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Sinyard, Neil, 2003. 'Intimate Stranger: The Early British Films of Joseph Losey'. MacKillop and Sinyard, 111-124.
- Siska, William Charles, 1980. *Modernism in the Narrative Cinema: The Art Film as a Genre*. New York: Arno Press.

- Sitney, P Adams, 2002. *Visionary Film: The American Avant-Garde 1943-2000*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Claire, 2000 (a). 'Travelling Light: New Art Cinema in the 90s'. Murphy, 145-55.
- Smith, Gavin, 2000 (b) (1990). 'Food for Thought: An Interview with Peter Greenaway'. Gras and Gras, 91-105.
- Stack, Oswald, 1969. *Pasolini*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Stam, Robert, 2000. *Film Theory: An Introduction*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Stephen, Ralph and J.R. Debrix, 1965. *The Cinema as Art*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Stetco, Dayana, 2001. 'The Crisis of Commentary: Tilting at Windmills in Peter Greenaway's *The Cook, the Thief, his Wife and her Lover*'. Willoquet-Maricondi and Alemany-Galway, 203-222.
- Stoneman, Rod and Hilary Thompson, 1981. *The New Social Function of Cinema: A Catalogue of B.F.I Productions 1979-1980*. London: BFI.
- Stoneman, Rod, 1996. 'Incursion and Inclusion: The Avant-Garde on Channel Four 1983-93'. O'Pray, 285-98.
- Street, Sarah, 1997. *British National Cinema*. London: Routledge.
- Tavernier, Bertrand, 2003. 'A Conversation with Michael Powell'. Lazar, 22-35.
- Taylor, John Russell, 1964. *Cinema Eye, Cinema Ear*. London: Methuen.
- Taylor, John Russell, 1975. *Directors and Directing: Cinema for the Seventies*. London: Methuen.
- Taylor, Paul, 2002. 'The Music Lovers'. Pym, 786.
- Testa, Bart, 2001. 'Tabula for a Catastrophe: Peter Greenaway's *The Falls* and Foucault's *Heterotopia*'. Willoquet-Maricondi and Alemany-Galway, 79-114.
- Thompson, David, 2002 (a). 'The Pumpkin Eater'. Pym, 887.
- Thompson, David, 2002 (b). 'The White Bus'. Pym, 1285.
- Tibbetts, John, 1999. 'Breaking the Procenium: Tony Richardson, the Free Cinema, the Royal Court and Woodfall Films'. Welsh and Tibbetts, 49-80.
- Tonkin, Boyd, 1997. 'Will Lotter Funding Help Mike Leigh and Ken Loach Make More and Better Films? Not if David Putnam and his Friends Have Anything To Do With It'. *New Statesman*. 126: 23/5. 37-40.

- Tran, Dylan, 2000 (1991). 'The Book, the Theatre, the Film and Peter Greenaway'. *Gras and Gras*, 129-34.
- Truffaut, François, 1968. *Hitchcock*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Truffaut, François, 1998. *The Films in My Life*. New York: Da Capo.
- Turan, Kenneth, 2000 (1996). 'The Case for Mike Leigh'. *Movshovitz*, 84-97.
- Turman, Suzanna, 2000 (1992). 'Peter Greenaway'. *Gras and Gras*, 147-53.
- Tweedie, James, 2000. 'Caliban's Books: The Hybrid Text in Peter Greenaway's *Prospero's Books*', *Cinema Journal* 40, (1): 104-126.
- Tyler, Parker, 1962. *Classics of the Foreign Film*. London: Spring Books.
- Umland, Rebecca and Sam Umland, 2006. *Donald Cammell: A Life on the Wild Side*. Goldalming: FAB Press.
- Van Hooff, Anton J.L., 1990. *From Autothanasia to Suicide: Self-Killing in Classical Antiquity*. London: Routledge.
- Van Sant, Gus, 1993. 'Freewheelin': Gus Van Sant Converses with Derek Jarman'. *Boorman and Donohue*, 89-99.
- Vertov, Dziga, 1984. *Kino Eye: The Writings of Dziga Vertov*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Viano, Maurizio, 1993. *A Certain Realism: Making Use of Pasolini's Film Theory and Practice*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Vincendeau, Gene ed., 1995. *Encyclopaedia of European Cinema*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Vincendeau, Gene ed., 2001. *Film/Literature and Heritage: A Sight and Sound Reader*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Vogel, Amos, 1974. *Film as a Subversive Art*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.
- Walker, Alexander, 1985 (a). *National Heroes: British Cinema in the 70s and 80s*. London: Orion.
- Walker, Alexander, 2004. *Icons in the Fire: The Decline and Fall of Almost Everybody in the British Film Industry 1984-2000*. London: Orion.
- Walker, John A., 1993. *Art and Artists on Screen*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Walker, John, 1985 (b). *The Once and Future Film: British Cinema in the Seventies and Eighties*.
- Walker, John ed., 1999. *Haliwell's Film Guide*. London: Harper Collins.
- Walker, John ed., 2003. *Haliwell's Who's Who..* London: Harper Collins.
- Walsh, Martin, 1981. *The Brechtian Aspect of Radical Cinema*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Walsh, Michael, 1993. 'Allegories of Thatcherism: The Films of Peter Greenaway'. Friedman, 232-53.
- Ward, Gelln, 1997. *Postmodernism*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Watson, Neil, 2000. 'Hollywood UK'. Murphy, 80-87.
- Watson, Gary, 2004. *A Sense of the Real: The Cinema of Mike Leigh*. London: Wallflower.
- Welsh, James and John Tibbetts, 1999. *The Cinema of Tony Richardson: Essays and Interviews*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Williams, Christopher, 1996. *Cinema: The Beginnings and the Future*. London: University of Westminster Press.
- Williams, Christopher, 1996. 'The Social Art Cinema: A Moment in the History of British Film and Television Culture'. Williams. 190-200.
- Williams, Melanie, 2003. 'Yield to the Night'. MacKillop and Sinyard, 130-32.
- Williams, Melanie, 2003. 'Housewife's Choice: Woman in a Dressing Gown'. MacKillop and Sinyard, 143-54.
- Williams, Tony, 1993. 'The Masochistic Fix: Gender Oppression in the Films of Terence Davies'. Friedman, 237-54.
- Willoquet-Maricondi, Paula and Mary Alemany-Galway eds., 2001. *Peter Greenaway's Postmodern/Poststructuralist Cinema*. Lanham: Scarecrow Press.
- Willoquet-Maricondi, Paula, 2001 (a). 'Peter Greenaway: From Independent Cinema wto Mega-Cinema'. Willoquet-Maricondi and Alemany-Galway. 2001. 1-34.
- Willoquet-Maricondi, Paula, 2001 (b). 'Two Interviews with Peter Greenaway'. Willoquet-Maricondi and Alemany-Galway. 301-321.
- Winston, Brian, 1999. *Fire Were Started*. London: BFI Publishing.

- Wollen, Peter, 1973. *Signs and Meanings in Cinema*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- Wollen, Peter, 1993. 'The Last New Wave: Modernism in the British Films of the Thatcher Era'. Friedman, 35-51.
- Wollen, Peter, 1995. 'Possession'. *Sight and Sound*. 5 (9). 20-3.
- Wollen, Peter, 1996. 'The Two Avant-Gardes'. O'Pray, 133-43.
- Wollen, Peter, 1999 (a). 'From Signs and Meanings in Cinema'. Braudy and Cohen, 499-512.
- Wollen, Peter, 1999 (b). 'Counter Cinema: Godard's *Vent d'Est*'. Braudy and Cohen, 519-35.
- Wollen, Peter, 2000. 'Blue'. *New Left Review*. 6 n.s. (Nov/Dec 2000). 120-33.
- Wollen, Roger ed., 1996. *Derek Jarman: A Portrait*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Woods, Alan, 1996. *Being Naked, Being Dead: The Art of Peter Greenaway*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Woolf, Virginia, 1926. 'The Cinema'. *The Captain's Death Bed and other Essays*. London: Hogarth Press. 166-172.
- Woollacott, Janet, 1983. 'The James Bond Films: Conditions of Production'. Curran and Porter, 208-225.
- Wymer, Rowland, 2005. *Derek Jarman*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Yale, Pat, 1998. *From Tourist Attractions to Heritage Tourism*. Huntingdon: ELM Press.
- Youngblood, Gene, 1970. *Expanded Cinema*. London: Studio Vista.

On-Line Sources.

- Bradshaw, Peter, 2004. 'Radio On'. Available at:
http://film.guardian.co.uk/News_Story/Critic_Review/Guardian_review/0,,1321819,00.html
 (Accessed 12 November 2005).
- Jeffries, Stuart, 2006. 'Come Out Fighting'. Available at:
<http://arts.guardian.co.uk/filmandmusic/story/0,,1798042,00.html>
 (Accessed 20 June 2006).

Poschardt, Ulf, 2004. 'Stripped Pop and Affirmation in Kraftwerk, Laibach and Rammstein'. *Umelec International*. Available from:
<http://www.divus.cz/umelec/en/pages/umelec.php?id=334&roc=2004&cis=1>
(Accessed 21 November, 2005).

Rees, A.L., 2002. 'Locating the LFMC: The First Decade in Context'. Available from:
<http://www.lfmc.org/>
(Accessed 2 November, 2005).

Thorpe, Valerie, 1999. 'Reality Bites (Again)' Available from:
http://film.guardian.co.uk/Feature_Story/Observer/0,,52399,00.html
(Accessed 19 December, 2005).

UK Film Council, 2006. 'New Cinema Fund: Feature Films'. Available at
<http://www.ukfilmcouncil.org.uk/filmmaking/funding/features/ncf/ncffeature/>
(Accessed 20 June 2006).

Unattributed, 2004. 'Memorandum Submitted by Channel Four'. Available from:
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200203/cmselect/cmcomeds/667/3062402.htm>
(Accessed 20 January, 2006).

DVD Commentaries and Introductions.

Davies, Terence, 2001. *The House of Mirth*. Film Four.

Greenaway, Peter, 2004 (a). *The Draughtsman's Contract*. BFI DVD.

Greenaway, Peter, 2004 (b). *The Falls*. On *Peter Greenaway: Experimental Films 2*. BFI DVD

Greenaway, Peter, 2004 (c). *Vertical Features Remake*. On *Peter Greenaway: Experimental Films 2*. BFI DVD

Greenaway, Peter, 2004 (d). *A Walk Through H*. On *Peter Greenaway: Experimental Films 1*. BFI DVD

Greenaway, Peter, 2004 (e). *A Zed and Two Noughts*. BFI DVD

Leigh, Mike, 2000. *Topsy-Turvy*. Pathe.

Leigh, Mike, 2004. *All or Nothing*. Optimum.

Leigh, Mike, Katrin Cartlidge and David Thewlis, 2005. *Naked*. Criterion.

Russell, Ken, 2002. *Delius: Song of Summer*. BFI DVD.

Russell, Ken and Michael Kennedy, 2002. *Elgar*. BFI DVD.

Wenders, Wim and Dennis Hopper, 2003. *The American Friend*. Anchor Bay.

Willcox, Toyah and Peter Middleton, 2003. *The Tempest*. Second Sight DVD.