

ZSÓFIA ANNA TÓTH

***CHICAGO* IN ITS DOUBLES**

In my paper, I will discuss the question of the *double* in *Chicago* (2002). My aim is to investigate how and in what form(s) this phenomenon is present in the film. My stance is that one of the most significant constitutive elements of *Chicago* (2002) is the double since the film utilizes the various forms of duplication throughout the whole story. In my investigation, I will concentrate on the double structure of the story line and also on the double attribute of the two female protagonists and how these two are interconnected.

I would like to start with the structural duplication. The structure of the film is split because it has a double line of presentation. The entire film is built up in a way that the most crucial scenes or events are staged in two ways. One version of presentation is the one which “belongs to the original filmic story line”, in this, the events or scenes are “ordinary” parts of the filmic body. The other one is the “theatrical version” which is integrated into the filmic body. These are scenes, which still bear the features of a theatrical performance. These are small theatrical bits inserted into a film, however, not as alien implantations but as altered and integrated scenes which fit perfectly into the web of the filmic text.

The mode of film production is a bit different from an “average” musical in this case because the musical scenes are not shot in “filmic surroundings”, i.e., they are not presented in the “original filmic space” but in a “unique theatrical space”. Still, these theatrical scenes are shot in a filmic way to make it have certain attributes of the film and, thus, making it less alien because the aim is not to cut in remote and foreign theatrical bits about a similar issue but to make a whole by combining the elements of film and theatre, as well. These scenes are always shot on stage with stage decors and costumes with theatrical lighting and with a choreography designed for stage performance. However, the angle of shooting is not that of a “typical” static one. The camera eye often records the events from a full 360°, by this it happens that not only the stage is shown but also the spectators. It is an interesting – although not a unique – feature of this film that it shows “both sides of the performance”.

The interaction of the actors and the spectators is highlighted which disrupts, in a way, the sanctity of the theatrical sphere, yet the viewer can have a “real

theatrical experience”. There are several examples for this shot-counter shot relation between the performers and the spectators which obviously pinpoints the filmic features, although, by disrupting the theatrical aspect the filmic one is also questioned as via showing the presence and the actions of the spectators/viewers the “mystic” filmic sphere is also interrupted. An outstanding example for this is Amos’ performance as a clown or Mama Morton’s “entrée” but several other instances could be listed likewise.

Nevertheless, it is worth stopping here for a moment and having a closer look at the question of the two media. It has always been a problem how to interpret and define *theatre* and *film* in relation to each other and how to compare and/or make them compatible with each other. There are several aspects of these media that can be taken into account when attempting to carry out such a task. An example could be the following: “[m]ovies are regarded as advancing from theatrical stasis to cinematic fluidity, from theatrical artificiality to cinematic naturalness and immediacy. But this view is far too simple” (Sontag 1992: 362).

The next quotation presents clearly why and how cinema is able to encapsulate any of the performing arts within its scope, what is more, it differentiates between medium and art and claims that cinema is actually the one which “deserves” both titles: medium and art.

Because the camera *can* be used to project a relatively passive, unselective kind of vision – as well as the highly selective (“edited”) vision generally associated with movies – cinema is a “medium” as well as an art, in the sense that it can encapsulate any of the performing arts and render it in a film transcription. (Sontag 1992: 362)

This passage reveals that cinema is able to adopt any kind of performing arts because it is capable of unselective as well as selective vision, and in this way, it can create a filmic transcription of any of these. This is what happens in *Chicago*, as well. This way, *Chicago* (2002) can pay tribute to the original work, as well, since the original version was a play, a theatrical piece of art and *Chicago* (2002) in spite of its primarily filmic nature managed to provide a truly theatrical performance within its boundaries; and here again, it is important to emphasize that these theatrical bits are not separate units in a foreign organization but they are integrated parts of the whole like chocolate chips in a chocolate chip cookie.

The following citation goes on with the definition of cinema and theater in relation to each other. It is an essential task since one of the dualities of the film arises from this specificity that *Chicago* (2002) attempts to carry both a filmic and a theatrical nature in itself. In fact, it is a successfully carried-out attempt because *Chicago* (2002) is a film which not simply adapted the original story to its own filmic world like *Roxie Hart* (1942) did, but which reserved some of its original “theatrical roots”, what is more, it also included its secondary “performative” origins, i.e.: the vaudeville as the third adaptation of Maurine Watkins’s

play was a vaudeville in 1976. Thus, *Chicago* (2002) is a versatile and complex combination of the different artistic branches.

One *can* film a play or a ballet or opera or sporting event in such a way that film becomes, relatively speaking, a transparency, and it seems correct to say that one is seeing the event filmed. But theatre is never a “medium.” Thus, because one can make a movie “of” a play but not a play “of” a movie, cinema had an early but, I should argue, fortuitous connection with the stage. Some of the earliest films were filmed plays. (Sontag 1992: 363)

An interesting inversion of the succeeding claim can be detected in *Chicago* (2002). “Cinema, at once high art and popular art, is cast as the art of the authentic. Theatre, by contrast, means dressing up, pretense, lies.” (Sontag 1992: 364) Certainly, it is not the authenticity of cinema or the pretense of theatre is what is questioned in the film; the interesting aspect of it is that *Chicago* (2002) reveals or highlights the truth through and/or with the help of the theatrical scenes. These scenes make the story even more ironic, present the ambiguities and throw light on the problems by way of showing the events in parallel in two lights: in the “true”, everyday filmic version and in the “artificial”, abstract theatrical one. Quite many times, the discrepancy between the actions and what is said (shown in the two different versions) or the dual (different) presentation of the same event are the ones which reveal the truth and create an ironic, mocking impact. A good example for this can be the scene when the only innocent person is executed. This woman is called Hunyak and she is of Hungarian origin. She is charged with the murder of her husband but she did not commit the crime, however, she cannot prove it and her inability to speak “American” (Ebb & Fosse 1976: 72) makes her an easy prey for the juridical system to execute her as a scapegoat to prove their right functioning. In the 1976 and in the 2002 versions as well, it is stated that Hunyak (re)presents “the famous Hungarian disappearing act”. “And now, ladies and gentleman, for your pleasure and your entertainment – we proudly present... the one... the only Katalin Hunyak and her famous Hungarian rope trick. (*Hunyak disappears off stage.*)” (Ebb & Fosse 1976: 73).

The last quotation in connection with the nature and the difference(s) between cinema and theatre is about their different use of space. It is stated that editing is the tool which helps cinema in making use of space much more. It is true in the case of *Chicago* (2002), as well, since the editing of the film is incredibly elaborated.¹ In *Chicago* (2002), through editing, we do not only get a greater use of space but also the switch between the theatrical and the filmic space. The structure of the film became extremely complicated and complex by a tremendous editorial work, although, it happened absolutely to its advantage. The theatrical and the cinematic space is frequently and repeatedly switched, changed and combined throughout the whole film which makes it extremely spectacular and highlights its dualities. An outstanding example for this is when Amos is making his statement that he shot the victim lying on the floor while Roxie is singing

(“in the theatrical space”) about him. This is her mental projection of the event. She is thinking, day-dreaming about it, how all these happenings would look like in a “much welcoming way”. However, when it turns out that the victim is Fred Casely, Amos realizes that he was cheated and refuses to carry on. Roxie, first only in her thoughts, quarrels with him in a way that both spaces are shown in a parallel mode: Roxie “in the theatre” and Amos “in reality”. Then, she attacks him by moving “out of the theatrical space into reality”. She starts the movement “in the theatre” (which, however, is also part of the filmic body) and ends it in “reality”, in the cinematic space. The following quotation also explains the role and significance of editing in films and how this “process” determines greatly the nature and functioning of films and creates immense differences between the presence and visibility of a character in theatre or in film.

If an irreducible distinction between theatre and cinema does exist, it may be this. Theatre is confined to a logical or *continuous* use of space. Cinema (through editing, that is, through the change of shot – which is the basic unit of film construction) has access to an alogical or *discontinuous* use of space. In the theatre, people are either in the stage space or “off.” When “on,” they are always visible or visualizable in contiguity with each other. In the cinema, no such relation is necessarily visible or even visualizable. (Sontag 1992: 367)

Thus, it has been examined how the duality of the structure functions in the film. The double always creates something unusual, strange, still a familiar sensation (Freud, “The Uncanny” 1990: 339–376). The double structure of *Chicago* (2002) does create a special effect and with this an (un)familiar experience. Throughout the whole film, this duality can be traced. In these cases, a filmic event takes place and a “theatrical one” runs in parallel with a song and dance. That is why, the list of the scenes which are doubled will be given in a way that the title of the song will be cited.

The double scenes in question are the following: the first of these scenes is Velma’s introduction in the honky-tonk where she works, she sings the song “All That Jazz”, in parallel with her performance on stage, we get to know Roxie, and here, already at the beginning it becomes evident that the two women are doubles.² The second scene is the one (it has already been mentioned) where Amos is making his statement about the murder in their apartment while Roxie is singing about him the song entitled “Funny Honey” “on stage”. The third scene is the “When You Are Good To Mama” scene where Mama Morton is introduced and Roxie starts her prison life. In the song, Mama sings about reciprocity and exchanging favors, she is a glamorous figure while “in reality” she is crude and unkind. The fourth scene is the “Cell Block Tango” scene where the women on murderers row recount the murders they committed. The six women talk about these cases one by one. The two interpretations run in parallel, one is where they are just talking to each other in prison, the other is the “Cell Block Tango

performance". One example from these stories is that of Annie who killed her husband because he lied to her about his other six wives (having them at the same time). She poisoned him, that is why, in the "abstract" theatrical version she pulls a red scarf out of his mouth. The fifth scene is where Billy Flynn is introduced, the song sung in the "theatrical version" is "All I Care About". Billy sings that all he cares about is love and he works only for love while "in reality", in the filmic body, it can be seen that the only thing he cares about is money. The sixth scene is the "We Both Reached For The Gun" scene where Roxie and Billy Flynn have a press conference. The theatrical version here is actually a marionette play, everybody is a puppet, or rather a marionette except for Billy Flynn and he is the one who holds and pulls the strings. He does not only direct everything, but he is a ventriloquist, too, who talks instead of others, as well. So, he moves everything and everybody and gives the word into everybody's mouth.

The next scene to be mentioned is not a double scene, although, it is an interesting and crucial one because it is about Roxie. She sings about herself, the title of the song is "Roxie", she sings about how famous she will be, what a great life she will have and how much she will be adorned. This scene is important because Roxie's narcissism is presented and there is a very rare, though, very spectacular part in it where Roxie is not only doubled but she is "multiplied". The fact that Roxie is narcissistic is evident throughout the film and in this scene it is displayed explicitly. Freud said the following about narcissism:

We have discovered, especially clearly in people whose libidinal development has suffered some disturbance [...] that in their later choice of love-objects they have taken as a model not their mother but their own selves. They are plainly seeking *themselves* as a love-object, and are exhibiting a type of object-choice which must be termed 'narcissistic'. In this observation we have the strongest of the reasons which have led us to adopt the hypothesis of narcissism. (Freud, "On Narcissism" 1984: 81)

Roxie clearly states in this scene that she was not loved in her childhood and now she wants compensation, she wants love from her admirers and she, certainly, admires herself, as well. What connects her to Velma is the following: "In this way large amounts of libido of an essentially homosexual kind are drawn into the formation of the narcissistic ego ideal and find outlet and satisfaction in maintaining it" (Freud, "On Narcissism" 1984: 90). In fact, the same can be said about Velma, she is also narcissistic. This citation is not to state that the nature of the relationship between Roxie and Velma was homosexual (however, it could be interpreted so). It is only quoted here to show how narcissistic persons form and handle their ego ideals; and Roxie and Velma are each other's ego ideals. Otto Rank says about Dorian Gray the following: "[t]ied in with narcissistic attitude is his imposing egoism, his inability to love, and his abnormal sexual life" (Rank 1971: 71). It is also true of both of Roxie and Velma that they are egoistic and that they are not really able to love anybody. It is uttered repeatedly in the film,

for example, how much they hate each other.³ For instance, towards the end of the film, Roxie does not want to work with Velma when she offers her the possibility because as she declares, she could not work with Velma because she hates her but Velma convinces her that it is not a real obstacle in the show business and, although, she does not claim it, still, it can be known in her answer that she is not really “crazy” about Roxie either. So, they start to work together and become very famous and successful.⁴

The seventh scene of the double story line is “I Can’t Do It Alone.” This is Velma’s song and dance, when in fact, she “doubles the double” since she presents alone the double dance they would dance together⁵, what is more she sings “I can’t do it alone”. Here, she offers Roxie the possibility to work together, to do a double act, although, it is because that by this time, she is the one who needs Roxie’s benevolence and help. Roxie knows this very well and refuses the offer. The scene is presented in a twofold manner, as well, one is in the prison “in the filmic body”, and the other version, “the theatrical one”, is shown in the vaudeville-like version of the prison hall where they are.

The eighth scene of the double representation is the “Mister Cellophane” scene. This song is sung by Amos Hart and it is about that he is always ignored and that no one ever takes notice of him and he never matters. (This has already been mentioned.) The filmic presentation starts with the closing pictures of the scene when it turns out that Roxie is (pseudo)pregnant and Amos is very happy about it, nonetheless, no one takes notice of him and he is not let to Roxie. It continues in Billy Flynn’s office where Amos is talked into suing a divorce because probably it is not him who is the father of Roxie’s (fictive) child. In fact, it is only a trick to help Roxie’s case, and after the desired result is achieved, it is asked of Amos that “Are you still here?” The “theatrical version” takes place in a theatre where he appears on stage alone dressed and made-up as a clown singing that he is Mister Cellophane who is inconsequential and invisible.

The ninth scene of the double presentation is one of the longest, and by all means, one of the most significant ones in the film. This is the “Razzle Dazzle” scene when the trial takes place. It is mostly Billy Flynn’s performance, but since it is a courtroom, there are many other people who are also of “certain” importance. This is one of the most ironic, spectacular and, it might even be said, shocking scenes as the double presentation of the trial procedure results in a really “true and rationalistic performance”. The “filmic version” takes place in an ordinary courtroom, everything happens in a way it would, while in the “theatrical version”, we see the whole “performance” in a circus-like, carnivalesque form. Billy even states that all this is a circus (and certainly he is the star of it).

The film closes with the scene “Nowadays” where Roxie and Velma perform this song and dance together as famous/infamous vaudeville stars. This scene does not have a double in the double story structure because the doubles of the film, that is, Roxie and Velma, are united in it and they finally perform their double act. With this, they become identical, they are both in white, they are both “purified and idolized”, “a double in one”; but since the double can never

be resolved, this ending is probably only a masking of the truth, and it actually is. (There are the white shotguns – used – and there are also the fallen red roses on the ground.) The life-death, love-hate duality is still present even in these final pictures. Nevertheless, let us have a closer look at the relationship of these women first to be able to investigate their “doubleness”.

First, here is a relatively compact summary of the double by James Diedrick on the basis of the work of Otto Rank. This gives an account concretely of what the double is, how it emerged and what its attributes are.

The theme of the ‘double’ has been very thoroughly treated by Otto Rank. In a 1914 essay, Rank [a colleague of Freud] explores the connections which the ‘double’ has with reflections in mirrors, with shadows, with guardian spirits, with the belief in the soul and with the fear of death; but he also lets in a flood of light on the surprising evolution of the idea. For the “double” was originally an insurance against the destruction of the ego, an “energetic denial of the power of death,” as Rank says; and probably the “immortal” soul was the first “double” of the body. ... Such ideas ... have sprung from the soil of unbounded self-love, from the primary narcissism which dominates the mind of the child and of primitive man. But when this stage has been surmounted, the “double” reverses its aspect. From having been an assurance of immortality, it becomes the uncanny harbinger of death... The “double” has become a thing of terror, just as, after the collapse of their religion the gods turned into demons. ... [my emphasis] (Diedrick)

The ideas of Polona Petek can be added to this to get an even clearer view of the double.

[T]he double is but one manifestation of the uncanny, which in fact does include phenomena such as *déjà vu* or, more broadly, doubled contexts. However, whatever form it actually assumes, the uncanny, according to Freud, always signifies re-emergence of narcissism because of the failure of the castration complex, which should have, so to speak, transformed Narcissus into Oedipus. (Petek)

In addition to all these things, one more passage is to be quoted on the uncanny and its related “field”, the double to help the understanding.

Sigmund Freud’s *The ‘Uncanny’* (“*Unheimlich*” 1919) deals with uncanny feelings that arise from intellectual uncertainty towards the opposition of the unfamiliar to the familiar (“*Heimlich*”). The term uncanny is based on the German word “*unheimlich*” which is almost impossible to translate into English. Freud argues that “(*uncanny*) themes are all concerned with the phenomenon of the “double”, which appears in every shape and in every degree of development” (Freud in *The ‘Uncanny’* 1990, p.356). Also Carl

G. Jung's ideas on dream language and imagery can be used to develop these arguments. Simply put, "the double" can be interpreted as possession of knowledge, feelings, patterns of behaviour and experiences in common with each other. This may also be a physical likeness, in which a double might look identical to its real counterpart. (Kokko 2004)

Otto Rank, in his study on the double, discusses the issue of the shadow-image and that of the mirror-image. (They signal more or less the same.) Both of these images play an important role in the ego formation and later, in the preservation of the ego, and life. The ego is connected to its image, to its mirror image, its ideal; if this double dies, disappears, then, the ego will die, as well (Rank 1971: 62–63). Rank also states that the double who personifies narcissistic self-love can become a rival in sexual love, and it might even appear as the messenger of death (Rank 1971: 86). The duality of the double as object of love (Eros) and at the same time bringer of death (Thanatos) is always present. The double is life and death in itself.

The double involves love, though, primarily self-love (which is narcissistic love), it is worth having a look at what Freud said about love-choice, object-choice.

We see that the object is being treated in the same way as our own ego, so that when we are in love a considerable amount of narcissistic libido overflows on to the object. It is even obvious, in many forms of love-choice, that the object serves as a substitute for some unattained ego ideal of our own. We love it on account of the perfections which we have striven to reach for our own ego, and which we should now like to procure in this roundabout way as a means of satisfying our narcissism. (Freud, "Being in Love" 1991: 143.)

This does not mean that Roxie and Velma were in love with each other, this only means that the ego formation and the choosing of the ego ideal works similarly to the processes when we are in love. At first, it was only Roxie whose ego ideal was Velma because she was everything Roxie ever wanted to achieve but as the film approaches its end, the situation turns and it will be Velma who wants to be like Roxie. In this way, they become each other's ego ideals with whom they want to identify and become united. At the mirror stage, we gain our ego, our identity through identifying ourselves with the imago, the ego ideal. Later on, there are new "identificatory processes" when we act similarly to the first one. The imago we identify with is the double, the mirror image which is (usually) an Ideal-I (Lacan 2001: 179). Hence, if there is a person one admires for his/her perfection, then, that person will become the ego ideal with whom one wants to identify and in this identification, a great amount of narcissistic libido "has its share".

Thus, Roxie is the figure who is central in both kinds of duplication in the film since when considering the relationship of the two female protagonists, we find

that they are doubles. The official poster of the film is a very good example for this. It explicitly posits this fact. There are the two female protagonists, and they are just like each other's "other", they are each other's complementary parts, they are as if they were each other's negative. In the middle stands Billy Flynn as an axis, as a mirror between the two figures and their reflections, mirror images. The two female figures are complementary since Velma stands on the left side of Billy Flynn, "the mirror" which separates and unites the two images/imagos, and Roxie stands on the right side of him. Velma can be seen in white dress, with dark hair, holding the gun in her left hand while Roxie is shown in black dress, with blond hair, holding the gun in her right hand. The make-up and the nail polish they are wearing are more or less the same, just like the hairstyle and the cut of the dresses they wear.

As it has been stated, it is Roxie who is the connection between the structural and the character duplications since the "theatrical versions" of the events are mostly the result of her imagination. She is the one who is day-dreaming, and through this, her imagination is set into motion and creates the colorful, spectacular and fabulous visions. It is essential here to cite what Freud said about day-dreaming and fantasies. "In the same way, the growing child, when he stops playing, gives up nothing but the link with real objects; instead of *playing*, he now *phantasies*. He builds castles in the air and creates what are called *day-dreams*." (Freud, "Creative Writers" 1995: 438) This is actually what happens in most of the cases when the "theatrical version" of the events takes place, Roxie starts fantasizing but why does she do it? The following quotation will answer this question.

Let us now make ourselves acquainted with a few of the characteristics of phantasing. We may lay it down that a happy person never phantasies, only an unsatisfied one. The motive forces of phantasies are unsatisfied wishes, and every single phantasy is the fulfillment of a wish, a correction of unsatisfying reality. (Freud, "Creative Writers" 1995: 439)

It is clear now that only that person fantasizes who has unfulfilled wishes and is, in general, unhappy. These are all true in Roxie's case since she is not really happy. She is not satisfied with her marriage, she does not love her husband, she gets involved with several men, she has liaisons, she drinks and spends time in bars and makes dreams about becoming a famous vaudeville performer. She would like to be famous and successful, she would like to be known and admired. She would like to be a star, but it is not given to her as we get to know from her during the performance of the song entitled "Roxie" that she never managed to make her dreams come true and the world was a big world full of NO for her (Marshall). When she day-dreams, everything is glamorous, fascinating and spectacular. She fulfills her wishes through these day-dreams, and we can see the events in "their reality" and "through the filter of Roxie's imagination", as well, and by this we get a double representation. With this double presentation, quite often a parody

comes to light (as it has already been mentioned).

After all this, let us have a closer look at how the relationship of Roxie and Velma actually got manifested in *Chicago* (2002). At the beginning of the film we can see a shot of a female hand who tears a poster off the wall. There are two names on the poster and one of them is torn. Soon, we get to know that the owner of the name is dead and the hand that tore off the name was actually the one which killed her, as well. Then, we see Velma Kelly on stage performing a song alone instead of together with her sister, Veronica. There is a double act done alone. At this time, Roxie Hart appears and she is shown as she is standing amazed next to a column, she is watching the show and it can be seen that she would like to be on stage by replacing the famous vaudeville performer Velma Kelly. Already, here, at the beginning of the film, the lives of these two women are interlocked, it is explicitly shown with the parallel shots of their lives. First, a shot – counter-shot-like interaction can be seen between them, it is not certain whether they really saw each other, but it might happen. Then, Roxie’s day-dreaming is set into motion immediately as she imagines herself on stage and replaces Velma, although, yet only in her dreams. The shot is made in a way that Velma can be seen with her back to the audience but as she is turning back, “she becomes” Roxie and when we face her again, we see Roxie in her place, certainly, “in reality” this does not happen. Roxie’s vision of herself on stage is only a wish-fulfillment.

The next parallel shot of them is when Velma is still on stage performing while Roxie is going home with Fred Casely. In the staircase, Roxie pulls Fred Casely to herself; Velma does the same with a man on stage as part of the choreography. In all of these shots, it can be seen that the two women are like each other’s reflections in a mirror. They do everything as the other’s reflection or mirror image. The following example for this is when Roxie is going up the stairs and Casely touches her leg, the same happens to Velma on stage. When in the choreography of the performance Velma’s hands are held up by a man in an erotic mode, the same happens to Roxie with Casely. When Roxie and Casely fall in an opening door by accident, a fall takes place on stage likewise. When Roxie reaches up during lovemaking in the bed, a similar scene takes place on stage that Velma reaches up and she is pulled up by the male dancers. It is made in a way that it seems the two movements are each other’s continuation.

Finally, the two women meet in person (in jail). When Roxie arrives at the prison as she is taken to her cell, she meets Velma and she tries to be very nice to her and she says that she was there the night when Velma was arrested. Velma is not really impressed, she just says “You were not the only one in Chicago”. Roxie takes another chance to make friends with Velma whom she admires and tries to get her attention with her eagerness. She asks for an advice about what she should do to be able to get out of prison but Velma is crude, she talks and behaves in a superior and airy manner and insults Roxie.

When they are shown in relation to someone else, they act again as each other’s mirror image. When Velma is in Mama’s room, she is behind her; when Roxie is in the same room, she is facing Mama. When Velma meets Billy Flynn

to discuss her case, she is on his right side; when Roxie appears and has her discussion about her own case, she is on Billy Flynn's left side. This is also the scene where the change, or shift between the positions, statuses of the two women is "visualized." The camera focuses on Velma's face first, and the "double" is blurred in the background, but the camera "decides to" focus on Roxie instead, and Velma's face becomes blurred. With this, Roxie comes to the fore and Velma has to withdraw. She becomes "only" the second one, and Roxie enjoys her "total victory" but she does not know that she can become the second likewise. Velma warns her to be cautious and not to be too self-assured and presumptuous because this time will arrive for her, as well, because for Billy Flynn, the most important person is always himself. Before this switch, Velma shows to Billy Flynn the trick she would like to use at the trial, she wants to show a flash of her tights to attract the jury's attention and sympathy. Later, this trick is "stolen" from her as Roxie makes use of it at her own trial.

Roxie becomes "glorious", everything goes just fine for her. She becomes famous, a lot of newspaper articles are written about her, the press and everything is full of her. Everybody knows her and she is adorned. Velma can hardly stand this and she becomes desperate. Now, it is Roxie who is in the spotlight, she is the successful and the famous one. The roles changed, as well. Velma hates her even more and does not know what to do. Now, she is the "double" in the background, and she does not like it. She wants to be like Roxie. That is why, she sets herself into motion and makes the great step in spite of her immense loathing (and admiration). She approaches Roxie with kindness, she offers her caramels and she asks her to be her partner after they got out. Now, she is really in need of Roxie's approval but Roxie, knowing this, does not provide Velma with this ease. She talks and behaves in a superior and airy mode and she refuses Velma's advances. Velma even sings and dances to convince her; Roxie actually enjoys the performance quite much but she does not want to show it and tries to pretend that she is engrossed in reading the newspaper. Finally, she leaves and tops the whole situation with an insult towards Velma who gets everything back from her "double".

However, soon, they both become "seconds" since a "new inmate" arrives, and Billy Flynn in hope of better prospects concentrates on the newcomer. Now, Roxie and Velma are both in the same boat. Velma even draws Roxie's attention to this fact when Roxie comes up with a new idea, that she is pregnant. This makes Velma angry again. Nevertheless, soon "they get into the same boat again" when Roxie fires Billy Flynn after a quarrel with him and it turns out that Hunyak will be executed as she has lost the last appeal, as well. Now, both Velma and Roxie are scared and compassionate.

In the end, they manage to get out of prison, although, the way out is through the court. It is worth having a look at them when they take the stand. Here, the mirror image is valid again since Roxie turns her head to the left while Velma to the right. Their dresses are absolutely opposite but Roxie's one is, in fact, a mask, a costume only.

After having been freed, they try to manage to live properly and start a new life but it turns out that they cannot really manage without each other. Roxie is not successful, in spite of her attempts she cannot get a job. After an unlucky audition, it turns out that Velma was/is present and makes an offer to Roxie again that she refuses again. Here, the roles change, as well, since at the beginning of the film it was Roxie who was watching Velma performing. Here, towards the end of the film, it is Velma who is the spectator and Roxie becomes the performer (even if not the best one). At first, Roxie refuses the offer, but this time, Velma manages to convince her (although, her torn stockings had a lot to do with it) and they start to work together.

In the end, the two spotlights have two stars to throw their lights on, not only one. Finally, Roxie and Velma realize that there is no way out, they have to work together because they cannot do anything without the other one. They create a unity and this way they try to complement, supplement and compensate each other in their differences and in their similarities.

Notes

- ¹ Martin Walsh won the Academy Award for “Best Editing” for his work in *Chicago* (2002) in 2003.
- ² I will go into details about it later.
- ³ Although, it is also a well-known fact that love and hate spring from the same source.
- ⁴ But there are still a few things to be discussed before this “happy ending.”
- ⁵ Although, this is not the only case when she performs a double dance alone. Already, at the beginning of the film, she performs the dance she danced together with her sister; but she manages very well. In a way, she loses her double at the beginning of the story and gains another one by the end of it.

References

- Diedrick, James (2004) ‘The Uncanny and The Double’. Handout for the course “English 337: Victorian sexualities” @ Albion College. Albion, Michigan. Accessed: 5 Dec. 2004 <http://www.courses.albion.edu/Arhieved_Fall2001/eng337diedrick/Freuduncanny.htm.>
- Ebb, Fred and Fosse, Bob (1976) *Chicago. A musical vaudeville*. New York: Samuel French Inc.
- Freud, Sigmund (1990) ‘The Uncanny’. In: Dickson, Albert (ed.) *The Penguin Freud Library Vol. 14. On Art and Literature*. Trans. James Strachey. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 339–376.
- Freud, Sigmund (1984) ‘On Narcissism: An Introduction’. In: Richards, Angela (ed.) *The Penguin Freud Library Vol 11. On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. James Strachey. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 65–95.
- Freud, Sigmund (1991) ‘Being in Love and Hypnosis’. In: Dickson, Albert (ed.) *Civilization, Society and Religion: Group Psychology, Civilization and its Discontents and Other Works. Sigmund Freud*. Trans. James Strachey. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 141–147.
- Freud, Sigmund (1995) ‘Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming’. In: Gay, Peter (ed.) *The Freud Reader*. London: Vintage, 436–443.

- Kokko, Valterri (2004) 'Psychological Horror in the Films of David Lynch.' *Wider Screen* 1. Accessed: 5 Dec. 2004 <http://www.film-o-holic.com/widerscreen/2004/1/psychological_horror_in_the_films_of_lynch.htm>
- Lacan, Jacques (1949) 'The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience'. In: Rivkin, Julie and Ryan, Michael (eds) (2001) *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 178–183.
- Marshall, Rob (dir.) (2002) *Chicago*. written by Bill Condon. Miramax Films
- Petek, Polona (2003) 'Narcissus and Echo at the movies'. Conference paper given at the Postgraduate Conference 2003 at the University of Melbourne. Accessed: 5 Dec. 2004 <<http://www.ahcca.unimelb.edu.au/events/conferences/WLB/petek.htm>>
- Rank, Otto (1971) *The Double. A Psychoanalytic Study*. Trans. Harry Tucker, Jr. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Sontag, Susan (1992) 'Film and Theatre'. In: Mast, Gerald (ed.) *Film Theory and Criticism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 362–374.
- Watkins, Maurine (1927) *Chicago*. New York: Alfred A Knopf.
- Wellman, William A. (dir.) (1942) *Roxie Hart*. written by Nunnally Johnson. Twentieth Century Fox.

Mgr. Zsófia Anna Tóth
Institute of English and American Studies
Faculty of Arts, University of Szeged
Egyetem u. 2.
6722 Szeged
Hungary
tothzsof@lit.u-szeged.hu