



STANLEY KUBRICK'S

Lolita

Freudian Psychoanalysis in Kubrick's *Lolita*: Quilty

Marrit Dide Meinema 4252993

Dr. Lieke Stelling & Prof Dr. David Pascoe

February 2018

BA Thesis English Language and Culture, Utrecht University

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Chapter 1 – Freudians, Keep Out.	7
Chapter 2 – Quilty as Dr Zemph and the Mysterious Midnight Caller	16
Chapter 3 – Quilty as the Psychological Double.....	25
Conclusion.....	34
Works Cited.....	37
Appendix A – Transcripts of Stanley Kubrick’s 1962 Film Adaptation of <i>Lolita</i>	40
I. School Psychologist Dr Zemph.....	40
II. The Mysterious Midnight Call	43
III. The Veranda Scene.....	44
Appendix B: Stills from Stanley Kubrick’s 1962 Film Adaptation of <i>Lolita</i>	48

Introduction

Three years after the publication of his novel *Lolita* in 1955 by Olympia Press in France, Vladimir Nabokov was approached by Stanley Kubrick and James B. Harris for the film rights of *Lolita* (Julia Trubikhina and Eiiulieia Kunina 143). According to Trubikhina and Kunina, the writing of the screenplay turned out to be a cumbersome process: Nabokov turned down Kubrick's and Harris's offer to write the screenplay himself and the first screenplay written by Calder Willingham was rejected by Kubrick, because he contemplated a marriage between Lolita and Humbert to evade censorship issues (143). Kubrick expressed in a telegram to Nabokov that he believed Nabokov "was the only one for [writing the] screen play" (144). Thus, after some discussion, Nabokov set out to write the screenplay. However, his screenplay, which would have taken four hours to run, had to be drastically condensed, which Kubrick did to 152 minutes (153). Due to this need of contraction, it is not surprising that Kubrick used only bits and pieces of the scripts in the production of his film adaptation of the famous novel (Mario Falsetto xvii). However, it was surprising for Nabokov.

After its release in 1962, Kubrick's film adaptation of *Lolita* was criticised for being unfaithful to the original. According to Dan E. Burns, the main reason for this was that it did not represent in a visual manner the same literary wit on which the narrative of the novel thrives (245). However, as Alfred Appel, Jr., states, this would have been impossible for "even the most stylised of productions" because the effects of *Lolita* depend largely on the "richly rhetorical first person narrator", namely, Humbert Humbert (237). More importantly, Kubrick did not agree with the opinion of the critics that Nabokov's prose style was the most important part of *Lolita*'s narrative. He felt that, while "the quality of the writing is one of the elements that make a novel great", "to take the prose style as any more than just a part of a great book is simply misunderstanding just what a great book is" (14). To him, the prose style

of a work was the writer's artistic tool to enchant its reader as to enable him to communicate his experiences, emotions and thoughts (14).

According to Kubrick, it were exactly these experiences, emotions and thoughts that needed to be dramatized in film and not the specific prose style of a certain author (14). He viewed the directing of a film as a continuation of the writing process and saw the actor as the writer's medium to transform the meaning of their work – their emotions, thoughts and experiences – into an emotional experience in the audience (14). Furthermore, due to censorship issues, it was difficult for Kubrick to visualise or even hint at the sexual relation between Humbert and Lolita. Therefore, the theme of paedophilia seems to have fallen into the background in the film. However, the observant viewer will notice that Kubrick found a resourceful way to imply their sexual relationship by means of another theme, namely, Freudian psychoanalysis.

In this research, psychoanalysis will refer to Freud's version of this concept. Freud invented the term psychoanalysis and over time attached two definitions to it: "(1) a particular method of treating nervous disorders and (2) the science of unconscious mental processes, which has also been appropriately described as "depth-psychology"" ("Sigmund Freud on Psychoanalysis" n.p.). Thus, as this research will focus on Freud's concept of psychoanalysis, the term will only refer to his theories and his methods. According to Saul McLeod, the main goal of Freud's psychoanalysis was to make the unconscious conscious (n.p.). Freud found that if the "repressed material is ... made part of the conscious mental functions ... the psychic conflict which then arises, the same which the patient wished to avoid, is made capable of a happier termination, under the guidance of the physician, than is offered by repression" ("The Origin and Development of Psychoanalysis" 196). During a session, Freud's techniques included that of the interpretation of the patient's dreams and their childhood memories, and free association, which involves a therapist reading aloud a list of

words to which the patient should respond immediately with “the first thing that comes to mind” (McLeod n.p.). It is by means of these techniques that Freud hoped to uncover repressed memories which could ultimately lead to the remedy for the patient’s problems.

According to Frank Krutnik, Freudian psychoanalysis had become popularised in Hollywood films in the 1940s (45). For some time, the Hollywood film industry had been resistant due to the importance of sex in Freud’s psychoanalytical theories, but after a while directors started to insert references to his theories or certain psychoanalytic concepts into their films (45). Psychiatrists or psychoanalysts even began to appear in films, but more importantly, the use of Freud’s psychoanalytic theories became a way to evoke hidden sexuality because this could not be shown directly: “The association between psychoanalysis and sex allowed a mode of indirect representation” (Krutnik 50). Therefore, besides the fact that Kubrick himself was “versed in Freudian theory and fascinated by the unconscious”, the concept of psychoanalysis must have been especially interesting to him for his film adaptation of Nabokov’s *Lolita* in order to hint at the sexual relationship between Humbert and Lolita (Ransom 32).

In his cinematographic adaptation of the novel, it becomes clear that Kubrick took great interest in the Freudian games and the scorn towards psychoanalysis that Nabokov inserted in his novel *Lolita*. As Kubrick found that the emotions, experiences and thoughts of the author were the aspect of the novel that needed to be dramatized, it is safe to say that Kubrick felt that Nabokov’s witty critique on Freudian theory was essential to the novel. To realise a similar sense of mockery of Freud’s importance of the unconscious sexual desires of the individual in his film adaptation, he made the necessary modifications for it to be adequately represented on the screen, namely, through exaggeration and condensation. In other words, he used actor Peter Sellers and his character Clare Quilty as a medium to represent this mocking image of Freud and his theories, for example, his theory on neurosis

which argues that neuroses stem from a direct repression of the libido. For this purpose, the modifications applied by Kubrick to the character of Clare Quilty in relation to the narrative of Nabokov's original story of *Lolita* include: the addition of two personas to Quilty's character, namely, that of Dr Zempf and the mysterious midnight caller; the addition of Vivian Darkbloom as his companion and two consecutive dance scenes between Humbert or Quilty and Charlotte; and the comical and absurd improvisations done by Peter Sellers.

These modifications enhance Quilty's on screen time and purpose for the plot of the film, and thereby evoke Freud and his interest in unconscious sexual desires as a diagnosis for the psychological problems of his patients. Therefore, Kubrick has not only focused on the novel's critique on and mockery of Freud and the importance of sex in his theories of psychoanalysis, but he also shows that cinematographic adaptation lends itself pre-eminently for the mocking representation of this theme. The first chapter argues how Nabokov expresses his disdain for Freud's theories of psychoanalysis and his approach to art through use of various literary tools. This explains why Kubrick chose to implement his own references to Freudian psychoanalysis in his 1962 cinematographic adaptation of *Lolita*. Then, the second chapter will explain how the enhancement of Quilty's role in the adaptation has led to a visual mocking representation of the stereotypical German psychologist and Freud's theory on neurosis and its relation to the repression of the libido. Additionally, Kubrick has used the psychoanalytic references implied by these characters to evoke the sexual relation between Humbert and Lolita. This shows how the visual aspect of film lends itself perfectly for ridiculing this image of the stereotypical German psychologist and the Freudian theory on neurosis. Moreover, the different personas and accents applied by Peter Sellers insert Nabokov's motto of "Freudians, Keep Out" into the film because this concept of multiple personalities incurs problems for the psychoanalysis of his character. In turn, the medium of film allows for an effective way to apply different accents and personas due to the auditory

and visual aspects involved. Lastly, the third chapter will discuss how the addition of Vivian Darkbloom and the comical and absurd improvisations performed by Peter Sellers contribute to the theme of the psychological double. The visual doubling of Lolita and Humbert by adding Vivian as Quilty's companion implies the connection between Humbert and Quilty as doubles. Furthermore, Peter Sellers's improvisation of Roman ping pong confirms this role of Quilty as Humbert's double, and his nervous behaviour combined with his constant use of the word "normal" visualise Humbert's interiority on screen: namely, Quilty as the personification of Humbert's fear and guilt of his love for this fourteen-year-old girl Lolita. These additions made by Kubrick and Sellers to the film show how Kubrick presents the viewer with a mocking representation of psychoanalysis and how film lends itself perfectly for this representation by conveying the feeling of the novel and its protagonist in the actions of Quilty's character.

Chapter 1 – Freudians, Keep Out.

According to Stephen H. Blackwell, throughout his writing career, Vladimir Nabokov came to loath Freud and his theories on psychoanalysis, specifically when these theories were used to analyse art through the personal life of the artist (129). Nabokov even went to such length to preface most of his novels with a foreword directed as a warning to Freudians. In *Bend Sinister* he says "...all my books should be stamped, Freudians, Keep Out", while *The Eye* begins with a warning that his novels are "blessed by a total lack of social significance" and "myth-proof", thereby, making the stories impossible to analyse (Berman 402). Freud's theories were in some cases the opposite of what Nabokov stood for: for example, according to Leland de la Durantaye, Nabokov's contempt of symbolism and allegories partly came from the way Freud used symbols to "kill the individual dream", thereby, generalising the peculiarities that life is so full of (61). Goldman states that Nabokov expresses this in *Lolita* by means of Humbert's use of allegories and symbols to describe Lolita as "an abnormal sexual deviant deserving or inviting exploitation" or as he likes to call her, a *nymphet* (103). When looking at Freud's analysis of one of Leonardo da Vinci's childhood memories, de la Durantaye argues that critics find that Freud has an eye for detail (65). However, due to Freud's belief that "every dream or act must have a meaning other than itself" (65), he studies them through a general set of symbols which could have never satisfied Nabokov's passion for "the divine details" (68). Freud's psychoanalysis sought to "uncover the general", while "neglect[ing] the particular" which went against Nabokov's passion for uniqueness and individuality (68).

This chapter discusses how Nabokov challenges Freudian theories of psychoanalysis within *Lolita*, because this is relevant for the explanation of Kubrick's use of the theme in the character of Clare Quilty in other chapters. Nabokov's criticism on Freud's theories of psychoanalysis is extensively expressed in his novel *Lolita*. Firstly, Humbert "discredit[s] the

Freudian view of the artist” by anticipating the advice the psychoanalyst would give him to cure his nympholepsy (Butler 429). Also, he consistently belittles the profession of psychiatrist and tricks his own psychiatrists. Secondly, the Foreword by fictional author Dr John Ray, Jr., serves as parody on the moral warning often prefacing obscene works and it asserts Nabokov’s view of l’art pour l’art. Thirdly, Quilty is created as the personification of Freud and his “vulgar reductionism” (Ingham 44) and as parody of the psychological double.

According to Stephen Butler, Humbert applies several tactics in his narrative to debunk the Freudian attempt to explain an artist’s work or someone’s personal life through his “*unconscious* sexual conflicts” (original emphasis) (429). He explains that one of Humbert’s strategies is rejecting the notion of unconsciousness by emphasising a complete awareness of his “neurosis” and its source: the abrupt ending to his summer love with Annabel Leigh (429). Butler suggests that Annabel’s untimely death before they could consummate their love was the onset of his *nympholepsy*, “haunting” Humbert until he meets Lolita, which confirms the consciousness of his psychological defect (429). He argues that consequently, Humbert anticipates that future psychoanalysts would want him to look for a beach identical to the one in his childhood to relieve himself of “the “subconscious” obsession of an incomplete childhood romance” (Nabokov 188). As Butler states, by means of this anticipation Humbert actively silences the psychoanalyst (429). Additionally, he further deflates the argument of the expected release of his obsession by saying that his quest was “... far from being the impulse of the subconscious, [it] had become the rational pursuit of a purely theoretical thrill” (Nabokov 169). According to Thomas R. Frosch, when Humbert finally reaches an equivalent of the beach he spent the summer with Annabel, his time there with Lolita is intolerable to such an extent that Humbert “had as little desire for her as for a manatee” (43).

More importantly, de la Durantaye argues that the rise of psychoanalysis coincided with that of criminology (69). Even though Freud never pardoned real crimes, his theory on

neurosis as stemming from childhood trauma became an excuse for lawyers and social workers to appeal for leniency for their clients (69). Therefore, Humbert's use of his unfinished childhood love-story with Annabel as a reason for his flagitious love for Lolita ridicules this negative consequence of Freudian psychoanalysis. Moreover, Humbert explains to his reader that Freudians to which he refers as "shams and shamans" misunderstand the relation between sex and art: "It is not the artistic aptitudes that are secondary sexual characters as some shams and shamans have said; it is the other way around: sex is but the ancilla of art" (Nabokov 295). This means that Humbert's sexual desires are not his incentive to immortalise Lolita in his memoirs, but his purpose is that of an aesthetic pursuit of *nymphets* and to solve the riddle of their "perilous magic" for the sake of art (151).

Lastly, Humbert consistently expresses his disdain for psychiatrists. He portrays them as rather unintelligent, for example, when he states that he considered studying psychiatry in his youth as the other "*manqué* talents" do (14). He calls them "dream-extortionists" (36), which is a reference to Freud's use of the patient's dreams for his psychoanalytic therapy and theory and Nabokov's view of psychologists as emotional blackmailers. During his trips to several sanatoriums owing to the resurfacing of his depression, Humbert discovers his enjoyment in messing with psychiatrists. He "invent[s] for them elaborate dreams ... teas[es] them with fake "primal scenes" and never allows them "the slightest glimpse of one's [his] real sexual predicament" (36). Gleefully, he informs the reader of their diagnosis of him as "potentially homosexual" and "totally impotent" (36). These examples clarify how Nabokov uses his protagonist to channel his contempt of Freudian theories. As Humbert acknowledges his *nympholepsy* and predicts the advice psychoanalysts would have given him to cure him of his affliction, he problematizes Freud's method of revealing unconscious desires to the conscious mind as a cure for psychological anomalies and his proposed relationship between sex and art. This allows Nabokov to nullify the Freudian view of the artist and method of

remedying psychological problems. Furthermore, Humbert's discovery of pleasure in tormenting his psychiatrists with fake dreams and primal scenes ridicules the efficiency of psychoanalysis in treating psychological aberration. Lastly, his belittlement of the profession of psychiatrists is also a direct sign of the contempt he feels towards psychoanalysis.

Secondly, John Ray Jr., the fictional author of the foreword, functions as a literary device to deride Freudians attempting to analyse *Lolita*, while simultaneously setting a trap for readers who oversimplify his introduction as a mere joke. Additionally, it serves the purpose of conveying Nabokov's own view of art for art's sake, and, in a sense, prepares the reader for Humbert's games and traps. James L. McDonald argues that the foreword serves as a parody on the traditional moral warning that often precedes unconventional texts, which would otherwise be accused of involving carnality and obscenity: the addition of the warning, thus, protects those works from these allegations (352). According to McDonald, this becomes clear by way of Ray's highly clichéd moralistic approach to Humbert's memoir: Ray urges the reader to perceive this story as a reminder to "bring up a better generation in a safer world" (Nabokov 1). Additionally, Frosch points out that the foreword also serves as Nabokov's defence mechanism, namely, to remove the allegation towards him that the text serves a moral purpose (43). As his introduction to *The Eye* already states, Nabokov had no intention of creating a story with any social significance (Berman 402). Frosch states that Nabokov sets up his defence via the obvious satire of the lesson of moral watchfulness on the part of "parents, social workers, educators" (43).

However, according to McDonald, seeing the Foreword solely as a joke would deny the full complexity and importance of John Ray Jr. as a character himself (352). As he states, a critical reader will soon detect a great affinity between John Ray Jr. and Humbert Humbert and a similitude of their playful use of language (353). He explains that beside the overt similarity in alliteration and anonymity in their names – H. H. and J. R. Jr. – which makes

clear that they are both figures of fun hiding behind parodic masks, Ray shows the same degree of intelligence and artistry (353-354): the foreword is his creative performance, as Humbert's is his confession, since it employs the same arrangement of stylistic devices, strategies of fabrication and distortion as Humbert does in his memoir. In this sense, the foreword prepares the reader for the artifice of Humbert's narrative and the games he plays with his readers, allowing them to take part in these games. Furthermore, McDonald states that Ray separates Humbert, the artist, from Humbert's memoir, the work of art: he critically defends the memoir by pointing out that art should always "surprise" its viewer because of the constant need for originality and wonders at the beauty of Humbert's language and the text's aesthetics (353). Contrastingly, Ray remorselessly criticises Humbert the author as "a "horrible . . . abject" creature, "a shining example of moral leprosy," clearly "abnormal" and "not a gentleman"" (353). Due to the way Ray rejects the author of the memoir because he is a pervert, but glorifies the memoir despite its sexual content, he confirms Humbert's notion that "sex is but the ancilla of art" (295). Therefore, Ray's juxtaposition between the author and the memoir objects to the Freudian approach to art and its view of the artist. In addition, Ray's view of the memoir is directly in line with Nabokov's view of art for art's sake as he states that the sexually implicit scenes are the ones that are strictly functional for the story to make sense and that "as a work of art, it transcends its expiatory aspects" (3).

It is exactly this mockery of psychiatrists, the Freudian view of the artist, Freud's approach to art and the parody on the traditional moral warning of uncommon works combined with the sense of seriousness in Ray's foreword that resembles Humbert's style and prepares the reader for his games. All the while, it shows the readers how Nabokov felt towards these things. Ray perfectly conveys Nabokov's view of *l'art pour l'art* through separation of memoir and creator, in spite of his profession as psychiatrist and therefore, his status as a qualified Freudian. Simultaneously, the foreword reminds the reader of a satiric

version of the well-known introduction of the medical or scientific testimony so often seen in controversial works (McDonald 354).

Thirdly, as John Ingham suggests, Quilty represents Freud in terms of psychoanalysis and Humbert as the second version of Freud embodies the Oedipus complex (44). Humbert, “King Sigmund the Second” (Nabokov 125), as the personification of the Oedipus complex, literally murders psychoanalysis by taking Quilty’s life and it is in this manner that Nabokov offers the reader an escape from Freud’s “sexual reductionism” (45). This escape allows the artist freedom to transcend “unconscious wishes and cultural influences” because during their last encounter, Humbert reaches the point of love for Lolita after merging his sexual fantasies of nymphets with her subjective being. Consequently, he also engages in an artistic relationship with her (45). Firstly, it becomes apparent that Quilty is the embodiment of Freud during their first encounter on the veranda of the Enchanted Hunters Hotel, where he takes on the position of psychiatrist (42). As if he is interviewing a patient, Quilty sits quite out of Humbert’s sight, but close enough for Humbert to hear the absurd questions he asks. Furthermore, when Humbert and Lolita check out the next day, Humbert talks of a man who is looking at Lolita “over his dead cigar” which Ingham states is a metonymic reference to Freud, who was often portrayed holding a cigar (42).

Moreover, it is not surprising that Nabokov would have a pornographic playwright as Quilty represent Freud, as Blackwell states that Nabokov’s parody of Freud often focuses on the sexual obsession of his theories (133). Furthermore, Ingham argues that Freud has set himself up for Nabokov’s parody through his case-study of thirteen-year-old Dora and her hysteria (44). He explains that in *Lolita*, Humbert, Quilty and Lolita are respectively similar to Dora’s father, Herr K and Dora. He states that Herr K was a “philanderer and a paedophile”, therefore, by sympathising with Herr K, Freud seems to identify with his paedophilic desires for Dora (43). Furthermore, his sexualisation of her and coercion of

“phallogocentric interpretations” upon her do not put him in a better light (44). According to Ingham, Nabokov seems to have used this case study for Quilty’s play in the novel: when Diana, who represents Dora and is played by Lolita, takes the Young Poet to the farm to kiss him, Quilty seems to agree with Freud’s view that “Dora should have relished the kiss from Herr K” (which is represented by the red caps) (44). This in turn refers to Nabokov’s disdain of Freud’s crass generalization of Dora’s love for her father. By making Quilty a playwright, Nabokov implies that Freud is, like him, “a writer of fiction who produces little more than pornography” (44). Humbert, “King Sigmund the Second” (Nabokov 125), the personification of the Oedipus complex, literally murders psychoanalysis by taking Quilty’s life.

Lastly, Quilty parodies the psychological double, a theme on which Otto Rank, one of Freud’s followers, has written an extensive theory (Blackwell 134). As Blackwell states, Nabokov must have read his essay on the doubles theme as Humbert mentions as another option for his pseudonym: “Otto Otto” (135). Moreover, as George Cummins argues, the identity of Quilty has often been explained as Humbert’s *Doppelgänger*, his “evil self” (359) or as other critics suggest: Quilty is the personification of his fear and guilt (Lara Delage-Toriel 1; Julian Connolly 51; Power 113; Schweighauser 25). What is striking is that the name Clare Quilty sounds almost the same as clearly guilty (which Humbert is of murdering Quilty!) (Connolly 53). The interpretation of Quilty as the personification of Humbert’s guilt is validated as Quilty’s presence grows simultaneously with Humbert’s guilt: at the Enchanted Hunters Hotel Quilty seems to immediately act upon Humbert’s anxiety about his trip with Lolita (54). Additionally, the similarities between Humbert and Quilty are notable: they share a great affinity for literature, they both speak French, they both are paedophiles, even their bathrobes match (Cummins 362). This resemblance between the two characters supports the notion of Quilty as Humbert’s double. However, according to Alfred Appel, Jr., in literature using the *Doppelgänger* motif, the double is often the condemnable part of the self, described

as the ape, but in *Lolita*, it is Quilty who calls Humbert an ape (71). This turns the tables on Humbert as it implies that he is just as much Quilty's double as Quilty is his, which makes sense as both their characters are as condemnable as the other. Furthermore, Humbert is haunted by his double, literally and figuratively pursued by his evil self throughout the novel. Quilty is omnipresent whilst staying in the shadows, which, in a sense, symbolises Humbert's entrapment: that is, his criminal, yet agonising passion for Lolita and his feeling of shame and self-hatred (Burns 247). The parody of the double motif is taken to an even greater extent by Humbert claiming that they are indistinguishable from one another during their fight in Pavor Manor: "I rolled over him. We rolled over me. They rolled over him. We rolled over us" (Nabokov 199). According to Connolly, due to this passage some critics have suggested that Humbert's murder of Quilty is his attempt to "cancel out" the baneful and detrimental aspects of his personality (55). The parody is then accomplished when the murder leads to Humbert being still "all covered with Quilty", meaning that guilt does not let itself be extinguished this easily.

Lolita is a perfect example of the way Nabokov criticised of the psychoanalytic approaches to art and the artist as devised by Freud into his works. The arguments given in the previous paragraphs present the literary tools Nabokov used to slip in this critique into the text. Through Humbert's anticipation of psychiatric solutions to his "neurosis", which invalidates the Freudian view of the artist, and his behaviour towards and opinion of psychiatrists in general; the Foreword by John Ray, Jr., which parodies the moral warning common to introduce unconventional works and confirms Nabokov's view of l'art pour l'art by means of separating Humbert, the vile artist, from his beautifully written memoir; and Quilty as the personification of Freud and his "vulgar reductionism" (Ingham 44) and as parody of the psychological Double, Nabokov mocks Freudian psychoanalysis which makes it one of the most important themes of his novel. As Kubrick felt that the author's thoughts and

emotions were the part of the novel that needed to be dramatized, Nabokov's witty and fiery critique on the importance of (an artist's) unconscious sexual desires and sex in general in Freud's theories must have been essential to the story in his opinion (14). Therefore, Nabokov's mocking representation of Freud's theories on psychoanalysis in *Lolita*, the novel, validates Kubrick's use of the theme in his 1962 adaptation of the novel.

Chapter 2 – Quilty as Dr Zempf and the Mysterious Midnight Caller

According to Linda Hutcheon and Siobhan O’Flynn, most film adaptation discourse is focused on loss, either of quantity – a literal loss of length as certain passages are cut – or quality. For example, a character’s intricate interiority in a novel is hard to translate with a similar degree of quality to film. She argues that performance media, which includes film, have long been perceived to be “incapable of ... representing the psychological or the spiritual” (38), because they are especially good at action. As Pauline Kael says, “[films] are good for immediate stimulus,” and not “at reflective thought and conceptual thinking” (Hutcheon and O’Flynn 57). Hutcheon and O’Flynn state that psychological and internal matter, such as thoughts and motivations, are difficult to dramatize: thus, the interiority of a character is difficult to visualise in a film (58). However, Stanley Kubrick has succeeded in doing so in his film adaptation of *Lolita*. In the novel, Nabokov uses his protagonist to express via first person narration his distaste for psychiatrists and ridicule them and Freud’s theory on the significance of dreams. Nevertheless, the representation of the author’s disdain for Freud’s theories in Humbert’s thoughts is impossible in the film, since the viewer cannot hear what Humbert is thinking. Therefore, Kubrick has chosen to represent the mockery of Freud’s theory of neurosis in the actions and appearance of another character, namely Clare Quilty. He embodies Nabokov’s nemesis Sigmund Freud and Nabokov’s contempt of psychoanalysis: specifically, Freud’s theory of neurosis as the “conflict between the libido and sexual repression” (R. Danielle Egan & Gail Hawkes 107). In doing so, Kubrick’s adaptation of *Lolita* shows how the medium of film lends itself pre-eminently for the mockery of psychoanalysis by means of behaviour and actions of a character.

Furthermore, as Hutcheon and O’Flynn explain: complex novels often ask for a distillation of their complexity in film, meaning, for example, that the condensation of a certain important theme can lead to a more powerful representation of the theme (36). Due to

the estimated expectation of a duration between 1,5 to 2,5 hours, the pressure on films concerning time is higher than on novels of which its readership does not anticipate the same estimated time to read it. To clarify this, Nabokov's screenplay would have taken four hours to play, which is too long for film, while the number of pages of which the screenplay consists, is more than acceptable to read (Julia Trubikhina & Eiiulieia Kunina 153).

Therefore, film adaptations often need to condense the narrative of the original book, as it should maintain an acceptable screening time for its audience. Also, in the translation from page to screen, a certain amount of dramatization is necessary: thoughts, descriptions and narrative must now be transformed into action, speech, sounds and visuals because "conflicts and ideological differences between characters must be made visible and audible" for the audience (40). Furthermore, on screen many events can occur at the same time, thus, making it impossible for the audience to perceive every sound, image or action, while on the page, the reader is able to observe every detail of the story word for word. Thus, if Kubrick wanted to incorporate Nabokov's view on psychoanalysis and in specific, Freud's theory on neurosis, in his film, this aspect needed to be exaggerated within the adaptation. Otherwise, it would surely be missed on the audience. Therefore, a shift in emphasis and focus on this mocking representation of Freud's psychological theories is necessary (40): in this specific case, this means that Kubrick needed to transfer the theme of psychoanalysis from the interior thoughts and experiences of Humbert in the novel to the exterior of the comical character of Clare Quilty and enhance the latter's onscreen time.

Through Quilty's visual and auditory portrayal of the theme in the film, Kubrick shows how the medium of film lends itself particularly well for the parodic representation of Freud's theories. The viewer still has to actively search for and pick up on certain clues to Quilty's presence and identity as with the text, but, for example, Quilty's impression of the stereotypical German psychologist Dr Zemph makes Freud's theory on neurosis more

accessible for the audience. This comical character added to Quilty's role in the plot allows the audience to recognise Freud's theory on neurosis as directly linked to a repressed libido as the object of ridicule in this scene. Furthermore, Kubrick's choice to have Peter Sellers play the role of Quilty serves to help the audience further grasp the mocking representation of Freud's theory on neurosis. His fame as a comedian and actor in his time ensured that the audience recognised him or his voice. Thus, when he is disguised or puts on a funny accent, the audience knows that it is Quilty, even when Humbert does not. Therefore, the addition of the role of Dr Zemph and the mysterious midnight caller to the character of Quilty leads to the enhancement of his role in the narrative. Furthermore, the references to Freud and psychoanalysis implied by these personas allowed Kubrick to represent in an indirect manner the sexual relation between Lolita and Humbert as to circumvent censorship. As already briefly touched upon in the introduction to this research, the popularised version of Freudian psychoanalysis in film was associated with sex. Thus, the psychoanalytic references of the character of Quilty were inserted by Kubrick to "close the gap between the constraints bearing upon direct representation and the expectations of the audience" in relation to the sexually implied relation between Humbert and Lolita in the original novel. Therefore, by adding these personas to Quilty's character, Kubrick gives rise to the mockery of Freud's theory on neurosis in the film, while silently implying the sexual relation between Humbert and Lolita.

One of the ways in which Quilty personifies the mocking image of the therapeutic aspect of Freudian psychoanalysis in the narrative is as school psychiatrist Dr Zemph. In the novel, Humbert is asked to come over by headmistress Pratt to talk about Lolita's behaviour at school, that is, the psychiatric evaluation of her behaviour (Nabokov 218-219). However, in the film, Kubrick has replaced Headmistress Pratt by giving Quilty the disguise of school psychologist Dr Zemph through which the theme of psychoanalysis almost immediately and comically becomes clear. His vulgar description of Lolita resonates with Nabokov's view of

Freudians as eroticists and Freud's theories as a form of vulgar reductionism. Additionally, his thick German accent and thick glasses clearly mock the stereotypical German psychologist. Lastly, the diagnosis of sexual repression based on Lolita's mere normal teenage behaviour ridicules Freud's theory of neurosis. Ultimately, this caricature of the Freudian psychologist confirms how film lends itself perfectly for Kubrick's mocking representation of the theme of psychoanalysis.

Quilty's disguise as Dr Zemph is the most obvious reference to Freud and psychoanalysis in Kubrick's film translation of *Lolita*. The transcript of this scene can be found in Appendix A. I. As Quilty waits for Humbert to come home, he sits in the dark and, in this sense, out of Humbert's sight. This refers to the sessions between psychoanalyst and patient as the psychoanalyst would also sit out of sight of his patient during a session. He says, "I sat in the dark so as to save you the expense of the electricity. Ha-ha-ha," (1:44:46). In doing so, he ridicules the previously mentioned aspect of these psychoanalytic sessions. Moreover, he calls sexual education "the facts of life" (1:45:17), which mocks the Freudian importance of sexual desires in his case-studies on complex psychological behaviour as the expression is rather euphemistic. It has a similar ring to it as the expression "the birds and the bees". Furthermore, Nabokov's view of psychiatrists and Freud as eroticists (Blackwell 133) is further emphasised and ridiculed by Dr Zemph's description of Lolita, which is rather lecherous (Pilińska "Chapter Three: The Handling of the Characters" 89). He describes her appearance in terms of what the boys of Beardsley High take interest in. His description is accompanied by a lewd moan and a hand gesture that looks as if he is holding two breasts: "...but to those boys over there at the Beardsley High she is a lovely girl, you know, mit, mit, mit, mit the swing, you know, und that jazz. She has got a curvature that, that they take a lot of notice of" (1:45:36).

Additionally, and maybe even most clearly a reference to Freudian psychoanalysis in this scene is how Dr Zemph reads aloud his notes on Lolita's behaviour in class (1:46:32). His notes state that Lolita is rude, chews gum vehemently, giggles often, is excitable, has poor concentration and has jokes of her own, which no one understands. From this list, he concludes that she is "suffering from acute repression of the libido of the natural instincts" (1:47:19). According to Nathan Abrams, Dr Zemph's remark about Lolita's private jokes "subtly evokes Freud's *Jokes and the Unconscious* (1905)" (29). Also, he argues that Dr Zemph's mention of "the home situation" really implies his obsessive concern for her sexual development (29). Naturally, this absurd diagnosis based on her actions also evokes what John Ingham already argues, namely, Nabokov's opinion of Freud's theories on psychoanalysis as a form of "sexual reductionism" (45). This means that Nabokov abhorred Freud's tendency to shrink complex psychological behaviour to mere unconscious sexual desires supposedly incurred during their childhood. However, more importantly, his description of Lolita's behaviour seems to be, at least for the most part, if not all, an enumeration of normal teenage behaviour. The diagnosis of a repressed libido evokes Freud's theory of neurosis, which according to him are based on the "conflict between the libido and sexual repression" (Egan & Hawkes 107). Therefore, to perceive teenage behaviour as signs of a neurosis and thus, of a repressed libido, is absurd. Consequently, Dr Zemph's use of this theory to diagnose Lolita's teenage behaviour as a neurosis and thus, as signs of a repressed libido ridicules Freud and his theory of neurosis.

Additionally, if Lolita *is* acting in a strange manner, this will most likely be due to her twisted relationship with her stepfather and not because of a repressed libido. The fact that Dr Zemph states normal teenage behaviour as symptoms of her state as sexually restrained adds to the parody of Freud's idea on psychological problems stemming from unconscious sexual desires. Of course, Lolita undoubtedly has psychological problems caused by her unhealthy

relation with Humbert, but this is not what Dr Zemph suggests in this scene. Nevertheless, the employment of Freudian theories of psychoanalysis in this scene hints at the sexual relation between Humbert and Lolita. As psychoanalysis and Freud were associated with sex, Dr Zemph's diagnosis of Lolita's repressed libido suggests and, at the same time, ridicules the sexual aspect of Humbert and Lolita's relationship. Furthermore, his proposal, or actually his threat, to send Dr Cutler, "the district psychologist of the Board of Education" with his "three-membered board of psychologists" to "investigate thoroughly" Lolita's home situation and the source of her so called "repression" emphasises Quilty's continual pursuit of Humbert and thereby, how Freud haunts the film as is the case with the novel which is explained in the first chapter of this research. Lastly, the addition of the thick and stereotypical German accent makes the reference to Freud complete.

Another one of Quilty's personae is that of a policeman during his telephone conversation with Humbert in the middle of the night, while Lolita lies in the hospital. The transcript for this conversation can be found in appendix A. II. In their conversation, Quilty expresses that his department is concerned about rumours that have been circulating about Lolita and him. He suggests that Humbert should see a psychiatrist because he is classified in their files as a white, widowed male. This is a reference to the Foreword by fictional author John Ray, Jr., which is part of the original novel (Nabokov 1). Then, he goes as far as to ask Humbert to give him a report on his current sex life, which results in Humbert warning him that he will hang up the phone. Owing to Quilty's already great presence in the film, the audience is able to recognise his voice, but simultaneously perceives that Humbert still has not the faintest clue who the mysterious caller is. The manner in which Quilty drives Humbert into a corner with his implied allegation of rape and urges him to see a psychiatrist resembles the way in which Quilty as the personification of Freud haunts Humbert in the original text.

Again, Quilty's inquiry of Humbert's sex life hints at the sexual relation between Humbert and Lolita.

Before Humbert terminates the conversation, Quilty jokes that "'afraid" is Freudian lingo—", but what could he mean by this? One of the possibilities is that "afraid" in this sense refers to the fear of castration. Freud believed that boys suffered from the Oedipus complex, leading them to fall in love with their mother, but also making them afraid that their father was going to castrate them (Zastrow 226). As their telephone conversation involves the topic of Humbert's sex life, it could be Quilty's way of joking that Humbert is afraid to lose his genitals. However, more likely would be that Quilty is joking about "afraid" as "Freudian lingo" for Humbert's "repressed libido", a remark evoking their conversation when Quilty was disguised as Dr Zempf. According to Freud, general anxiety or "expectant fear" is closely connected to certain types of libido ("Part Three: General Theory of the Neuroses. XXV. Fear and Anxiety." n.p.): on one end of the scale is sexual constraint which leads to anxiety and on the other end is total "gratification of sexual desires" which goes hand in hand with "fearlessness and bold daring". Therefore, Quilty's joke either refers to his diagnosis of Lolita's behaviour or the fact that he has stolen Lolita away from Humbert, as this will result in the repression of his libido because he will not be able to satisfy his sexual desires any longer without her. Of these two suggestions, the latter is most likely.

Lastly, the different personas employed by Quilty could be Kubrick's way to apply the "Freudians, Keep Out" motto of Nabokov. Due to Peter Sellers's elaborate switching between different characters and accents within his role as Quilty, it becomes impossible for psychoanalysts to analyse his character, and, therefore, to analyse Humbert. That is to say, the larger part of Quilty's onscreen time, whether it is as a voice through the telephone or incognito on screen, the viewer does not see the real Quilty. However, the real question is: Is there even a real Quilty? It seems that the viewer receives only glimpses of his real

personality at the dance and at Lolita's school play, but there is no evidence for this assumption. His quick alternation between different characters make it impossible to know for sure. The only real characteristics the audience can draw from his scenes is his sexualisation of little girls, his profession as a TV writer and his love for cigarettes. Therefore, the unlimited number of different personas and accents exerted by Peter Sellers in the film constrain the possibility of identifying Quilty and analysing his character. Thus, Peter Sellers's improvisations reinforce Nabokov's motto of "Freudians, Keep Out".

Ultimately, Kubrick's application of the two new characters to Quilty combined with Peter Sellers's improvised personas and accents shows how the medium of film, owing to its visual and auditory aspects, lends itself particularly well for the mocking representation of Freudian, psychoanalytic theory. Due to Quilty's references to Freud in the midnight phone call and his disguise as the school psychologist, he personifies the mocking image of Freud's theories on expectant fear and neuroses in the film. Firstly, Dr Zempf with his thick glasses and German accent mocks the stereotypical German psychologist. His lewd description of Lolita and his diagnosis of her teenage behaviour as an expression of her repressed libido ridicule Freud's theory on neurosis and the importance of sex in his theories in general. However, the diagnosis of Lolita's repressed libido also hints at and mocks the sexual relation between Humbert and Lolita. Also, the vulgarity of the description emphasises Nabokov's view of psychoanalysis as a form of sexual reductionism. Secondly, Quilty's midnight call, in which he threatens Humbert with police involvement in his sex life and calling in psychiatrists, resembles Freud's continual pursuit of Humbert as is the case within the novel. Again, the way Quilty wants to pry in Humbert's sex life evokes the sexual relation between Lolita and Humbert. In addition, Quilty's final joke on Freudian lingo most likely refers to the connection between general anxiety and a suppressed libido. Lastly, the different personas

and accents employed by Peter Sellers is Kubrick's way of inserting Nabokov's game of setting traps for Freudians.

Chapter 3 – Quilty as the Psychological Double

In his essay on film adaptation “Words and Movies”, Stanley Kubrick talks about how he approaches the translation from page to screen and how he chooses the novels that he adapts.

He states:

The perfect novel from which to make a movie, is not the novel of action but, on the contrary, the novel which is mainly concerned with the inner life of its characters. It will give the adaptor an absolute compass bearing, as it were, on what a character is thinking or feeling at any given moment of the story. And from this he can invent action which will be an objective correlative of the book’s psychological content.

(n.p.)

This statement shows how invested Kubrick was in the psychological aspect of the novel when transposing the story from novel to film. Film has long been thought to be incapable of showing the interiority of a character, because thoughts and motivations are hard to visualise on screen (Linda Hutcheon and Siobhan O’Flynn 58). However, Hutcheon and O’Flynn propose that the medium of film can find “cinematic equivalents” to imply the interiority of a character (58). Classic examples are the close-up to “create psychological intimacy” or the voice-over (59). For example, Dadaists saw film as a “privileged mode of conveying the unconscious”: they thought that use of slow-motion, unusual camera angles or strange lighting could portray this (59). However, these are not the only ways to show a character’s thoughts; namely, Kubrick uses a whole character, Quilty, to show what another character, Humbert, is feeling. To convey the interiority of Humbert in Quilty’s character, Kubrick makes use of the psychological double, which is also an important motif in the novel. He literally doubles Lolita and Humbert by adding the character of Vivian Darkbloom in the film as Quilty’s companion and uses two consecutive dance scenes between the men and Charlotte to stress their shared interest in Lolita and their distaste for Charlotte. Furthermore, Peter

Sellers's improvisations and different characters contribute to this double motif and help establish Quilty as the personification of Humbert's fear and guilt, thereby, showing how film's preference for action can effectively establish the mocking representation of Freud's theory on the Doppelgänger and thus, psychoanalysis.

In the novel, Quilty's role as Humbert's parodic double is not implied by their mirrored appearance, but through their shared disposition, eloquence in speech and literary affinity. This is problematic for an adaptation in film, because how do you convey the idea of two characters being each other's doubles if their appearance is not in certain ways alike? Kubrick has solved this problem with his visual doubling of Lolita and Humbert in the form of Quilty and his companion Vivian Darkbloom. From very early in the film onwards, the viewer is presented with Quilty and his companion Vivian Darkbloom, which is an anagram for Vladimir Nabokov. According to Krin Gabbard, Nabokov has inserted an anagram of his name in most of his works, but they are always a little different (25). In the novel, Vivian has voyeuristic qualities because of her relationship with Quilty. In other words, she is not actually a character involved in the plot itself, but her name is used in references to Quilty. The anagram might also be playfulness on the part of Nabokov and suggests Nabokov's authorial presence in the novel. Nevertheless, his screenplay suggests that she will play a bigger role in the narrative of the film, namely, she is involved in "procuring Lolita for her companion" (25). Yet in Kubrick's film, she is present in even more scenes than Nabokov's original screenplay and novel (26). Gabbard associates Vivian's long finger nails, cigarettes and snake bracelets with "distinctive phallic qualities" and states that she is no longer a "passive observer" but to certain extent "exert[s] a degree of quiet control over Quilty" (26). In this sense, Nabokov's authorial dominance is enforced in Kubrick's film, but also ridiculed because of her status as "a rejected screenwriter" and as a "marginalized and mute" enigmatic woman (Gabbard 27).

Furthermore, Lolita's presence as well as that of Vivian is to a certain degree dependent on the other. Whenever Lolita is with Humbert – if not in the same room, she is at the same place –, somewhere Quilty is also present, Vivian Darkbloom is there to accompany him: at the dance (25:00), at the Enchanted Hunters hotel (1:15:08), at the play (1:53:11-1:53:16). Additionally, when Humbert is alone, so is Quilty: for example, at Pavor Manor (03:35;), on the porch of the hotel (1:19:22) or during their talk when Quilty is disguised as Dr Zempf (1:44:25). Moreover, Kubrick's use of foreground-background shots mirrors the couples on camera. This shot is used for the first time when Humbert and Lolita arrive at the Enchanted Hunters hotel. Vivian and Quilty have just checked in at the reception desk and turn around to see the other couple arrive in the common area (figure 1, app. B). Directly afterwards, the same shot is enforced again when Humbert and Lolita register at the reception desk with Mr. Swine, while Quilty and Vivian hide behind the card-stand in exactly mirrored positions (figure 2, app. B). Furthermore, Vivian's role as Quilty's accomplice in procuring Lolita as stated in the previous paragraph is reinforced by their meaningful look as the assistant manager tells Humbert that they are "working on that cot" (figure 3, app. B), suggesting that she knows about Quilty's plan to steal Lolita away from Humbert.

Moreover, the addition of Vivian Darkbloom enabled Kubrick to imply the similitude in masochistic behaviour between Humbert and Quilty. During Quilty and Vivian's conversation with Mr. Swine at the reception desk at the Enchanted Hunters hotel, Quilty talks of how they judo together and how he loves to be thrown by Vivian: "... what happens is, she throws me all over the place ... I sorta lay there in pain, but I love it, I really love it, I lay there hovering between consciousness and unconsciousness, it's really the greatest" (1:14:36-1:14:58). Additionally, Vivian lays her hand on his shoulder in a non-romantic manner which suggests that she controls him as is the case with Lolita and Humbert as well. This shows Quilty's masochistic nature which resembles that of Humbert in a direct and

comical manner. In other words, Humbert and Quilty are both masochists, as Humbert lets himself be verbally abused and emotionally blackmailed by Lolita, while Quilty enjoys undergoing physical pain. For example, Lolita tries to seduce Humbert into allowing her to act in the school play and even though Humbert does not give in to her whining, he does forgive her obnoxious behaviour, mood-swings and shouting numerous times in promise of physical rewards. Also, Lolita controls Humbert in a sense: she has him believe that she gives in to his idea of a second road trip, while she is planning her escape with Quilty. This is implied by her conversation in the telephone booth after her fight with Humbert about the school play. She later confesses this when Humbert finds her in her new home four years later.

Furthermore, the two consecutive dance scenes in which Charlotte tries to dance with both men enhances the likeness between Quilty and Humbert since both are equally unwilling to dance with her. Additionally, Humbert and Quilty's obsessive interest in Lolita expressed in these scenes highlights the similarity between them even more. During Quilty's dance with Charlotte, he barely moves and allows her to do the steps as she likes (25:30). However, directly afterwards, Quilty gives her a slight nod and attempts to leave her, but Charlotte does not let him go that easily. She aims to remind him of the time they met, but Quilty cannot remember a thing: "Tell me one thing, are you a columnist?" (26:07) is what he asks her to her great disappointment. Charlotte tries to make him remember her, but the only thing arising from her story is that Quilty recalls her daughter Lolita: "Listen, didn't you have a daughter? Yeah, what was it now? A lovely, lyrical, lilting name like ... Lolita, that's right" (26:42). After the dance, Charlotte endeavours to dance with Humbert, but the same thing happens to her again. Humbert obsessively asks about Lolita while completely ignoring Charlotte's romantic advances. He inquires of Charlotte if it has been a good idea to let Lolita stay at the Farlows and while Charlotte turns on the stereo, he informs her that he does not believe Jean

and John will provide “the right kind of supervision” (30:10). She tries to change the subject of the conversation by proposing to teach Humbert some new steps, which he immediately refuses: “You do this so very well I’d much rather sit down and watch you” (30:33).

Therefore, the way both men obsess over Lolita and show their disinterest in her mother Charlotte stresses the propinquity between them. Through their rejection of Charlotte and use of her as a tool to learn more about Lolita, they are linked to one another: both are presented as paedophiles and show that they have no interest in women their own age.

The improvisations by Peter Sellers confirm his role as psychological double of Humbert which in the film as well as the novel functions to portray Quilty as the personification of his fear and guilt. The first hint Peter Sellers gives the audience of Quilty as Humbert’s parodic double is in the opening scene of the film. As Dan E. Burns states, Quilty’s proposal to play a game of “Roman ping-pong”, which is a game of doubles, establishes the double motif of the narrative (247). He starts serving the ball and says, “Roman ping” to which Humbert does not respond. Quilty responds by saying, “you’re supposed to say, “Roman pong””, which suggests that they are themselves in a game of doubles. Furthermore, as Claire Rosenfield states, “psychological Doubles may either juxtapose or duplicate two characters; the one representing the socially acceptable or conventional personality, the other externalizing the free, uninhibited, often criminal self” (328). In this scene, Humbert’s calm composure and neat appearance suggest that he is the socially acceptable and conventional one of the doubles, while Quilty evokes the free, uninhibited, criminal double with his drunkenness and messy appearance. Additionally, the chaotic interior of Quilty’s mansion accentuates the mental instability of Quilty’s character. However, throughout the rest of the film the audience will come to know that this distinction between the two doubles is not as clear-cut as it seems in this scene.

The next scene in which the theme of doubles is stressed by Peter Sellers is their conversation on the veranda of the Enchanted Hunters hotel. The transcript for this scene can be found in appendix A. III. Chronologically, this is the first meeting between Humbert and Quilty, even though the audience has just seen his murder. The scene is completely dominated by Peter Sellers and his comical improvisations. After Humbert sits down, Quilty enters the veranda. He creeps up from behind and leans on the balustrade with his back turned towards Humbert. After a nervous greeting on the part of Quilty, Humbert looks around to find no one else there and says “O, you’re addressing me, I thought perhaps there was someone with you” (1:19:23). As stated by Burns, Quilty’s response insinuates that they are one (247). He says, “I’m not really with someone. I’m with you. Heh heh. . . . right now, I’m on my own” (1:19:26).

Also, he pretends to be a policeman and asks Humbert if he is only staying because his sudden exit could seem suspicious to a policeman. His immediately following remark that he often looks suspicious himself, even to his fellow policemen, which he comically confirms by telling that he was once arrested by a colleague for standing on a street corner, emphasises how the two men are alike. Furthermore, his continual stuttering, the velocity of his speech and the almost obsessive use of the word “normal” gives the viewer a sense of nervousness on the part of Quilty. He says to Humbert, “it’s great to see a *normal* face, because I’m a *normal* guy. It’d be great for two *normal* guys like us to get together and talk about world events, you know, in a *normal* sort of way” (emphasis mine) (1:20:25). Once again, Quilty implies that they are the same. Nevertheless, Quilty’s constant need to express their normalcy incites the opposite reaction and causes him to look incredibly suspicious. Therefore, the way Quilty stutters, talks extremely fast-paced and constantly inserts the word “normal” into what almost appears to be a monologue represents the anxiety that Humbert is feeling about the fact that he is staying at a hotel with his 12-year-old ‘lover’ where now a multitude of policemen are

wandering around. Moreover, Quilty expresses his similar interest in little girls: “It’s running on my mind, I’ve been thinking about it quite a lot. I noticed when you was checking in you had a lovely, pretty, little girl with you... I wish I had a lovely, pretty, tall, lovely little girl like that,” which further confirms their twin-image, but also stresses Humbert’s anxiety even more that people might find out that Lolita is not his daughter (1:20:39).

Unfortunately, by cutting the Annabel story, Nabokov’s parody on Freud’s notion of the *Doppelgänger* as “the return of the repressed” seems to be lost in Kubrick’s film adaptation. However, when explained as “the return of negation” which Dimitri Vardoulakis states it can be paraphrased with, then it becomes clear that this is the case with Humbert and Quilty (102). Throughout the film, Humbert is so oblivious to Quilty’s presence that it almost seems as if he is ignoring him on purpose. According to Freud in his case-study on Dora, “there is no such thing at all as an unconscious ‘No’... The ‘No’ uttered by a patient after a repressed thought has been presented to his conscious perception for the first time does no more than register the existence of a repression” (101). The way Humbert runs away from Quilty in the veranda scene and turns down his idea of having breakfast together suggests that Humbert has consciously perceived the utterance of his own repressed thought by Quilty. Furthermore, on many occasions, Humbert could have easily identified Quilty, but still he does not recognise him. Quilty as Dr Zempf accidentally reveals his identity to Humbert when he lifts his glasses to light a cigarette. Additionally, when he calls Humbert in the hotel in the middle of the night after taking Lolita from the hospital, Quilty again pretends to be a policeman which should betray his identity because this is the same front he uses at the Enchanted Hunters Hotel. Also, Quilty embodies everything that Humbert does not want to see about himself, which is the fear of being caught and the guilt he feels towards his love for and abuse of a twelve-year-old girl. Therefore, it would be almost impossible for the audience to believe that Humbert is oblivious to Quilty. The fact that Humbert is unaware of Quilty

represents his conscious negation of their likeness and thus, Quilty's representation of Humbert's own repressed thoughts of paedophilia, which adheres to Freud's notion of the psychological Doppelgänger.

Furthermore, Claire Rosenfield states that according to Otto Rank, who had been Freud's apprentice for a long time: The Doppelgänger, which initially represented the guardian angel when it protected the character against "the destruction of the self", later became "precisely the opposite, a reminder of the individual's mortality, indeed the announcer of death itself" (334). In a way, this is exactly what Quilty is, because Quilty's arrival in the narrative is the onset of Humbert's life going downhill. The first allusion to Quilty as the announcer of death is during his pursuit of Humbert and Lolita on their road trip. As the couple has a flat tire, Quilty stops the car and waits a few minutes before he turns around. While Humbert tries to make out who is in the car behind them, the first hint towards his death is given. Humbert grabs his arm which has started to hurt intolerably: "My arm is killing me. I don't seem to be able to breathe properly" (2:05:58). These symptoms are the onset of a heart attack, which Lolita jokingly confirms: "Wait a minute. I once read in a Reader's Digest that this is the way heart attacks start" (2:06:25). Moreover, these first symptoms of a heart attack hint at Humbert's cause of death in prison, namely, coronary thrombosis. After losing Lolita to Quilty, Humbert starts on a path of self-destruction. After four years of hopelessly searching for her, he finally finds Lolita and learns about Quilty. This is the beginning of Humbert's end because after murdering Quilty, he is arrested for his murder and dies in prison of coronary thrombosis. Furthermore, Quilty plays both roles Otto Rank grants to the Doppelgänger: "he is at one and the same time [the] sexual rival and the messenger of death" (Christina Holmlund 36). As the latter characteristic is already explained, Quilty is Humbert's sexual rival in their struggle for Lolita's love: a fight that Humbert unquestionably loses as Quilty not only snatches her away, he is also Lolita's only love.

Kubrick's addition of the character of Vivian Darkbloom and the two dance scenes of Humbert or Quilty with Charlotte stress Quilty's purpose of being Humbert's psychological double. Furthermore, Peter Sellers's comical improvisations, including that of Roman ping pong and his nervous talkativeness, confirm Quilty's role as Humbert's parodic psychological double and in turn, visualise Humbert's interiority as the personification of Humbert's fear and guilt. Lastly, Quilty's portrayal as the sexual rival and the messenger of death adheres to the characteristic of the psychological double as described by Freud's apprentice Otto Rank. In addition, Humbert's deliberate ignorance of Quilty's presence validates Freud's theory on the Doppelgänger as the return of the repressed, because Quilty functions, in this sense, as the image of Humbert's repressed paedophilic thoughts. Consequently, these visual and auditory representations of the double motif and Quilty's personification of Humbert's unconscious mind through his actions and words, ridicule Freud's theory of the Doppelgänger as the "return of negation" or "repressed". Therefore, these modifications applied by Kubrick and actor Peter Sellers in the representation of Clare Quilty show how film's preference for action and direct stimulus works very well to establish the ridiculing image of Freudian psychoanalysis.

Conclusion

Kubrick's modification to the narrative structure of his 1962 film adaptation of Vladimir Nabokov's *Lolita* to begin with Humbert Humbert's murder of Clare Quilty, which Nabokov himself had proposed in his screenplay, has resulted in the possibility of enhancing Quilty's presence in the plot of the film. Kubrick gladly took advantage of this opportunity as his expansion of the role of Quilty allowed another one of the novel's most important themes to take centre stage in the film adaptation, namely, that of Freud's psychoanalysis: in particular, his theory on neurosis and its relation to the repression of the libido and "the return of the repressed" in his theory on the Doppelgänger. Kubrick's cinematographic adaptation of *Lolita* shows how the medium of film lends itself pre-eminently for the mocking representation of psychoanalysis by means of the actions and exteriority of one of its protagonists, Clare Quilty.

Firstly, in the novel, Nabokov's critique on Freud's theories of psychoanalysis is shown through his protagonist Humbert, the Foreword by Dr John Ray, Jr., and the psychological double Quilty. Humbert shares Nabokov's view of psychiatry as a useless profession and invalidates the Freudian view of the artist by anticipating their theories on the origin of his neurosis, which he calls "nympholepsy". Furthermore, Dr John Ray, Jr., presents the memoir to be useful as a psychological case-study, but parodies the moral warning which proceeds unconventional works. Additionally, he confirms Nabokov's view of art for art's sake through his separation of artist and artwork: he rejects Humbert, but praises his memoir. Moreover, in the novel, Quilty functions as the personification of Freud and his profession as a pornographic playwright represents what Nabokov perceived as Freud's "vulgar reductionism". Also, Quilty plays the parodic part of Humbert's psychological double. It is by means of these literary devices that Nabokov mocks Freudian psychoanalysis and makes it one of the most important themes of the novel. This substantial presence of Freudian

psychoanalysis in Nabokov's novel validates Kubrick's mocking representation of it in his film adaptation of *Lolita*.

Secondly, in Kubrick's film of *Lolita*, the necessary modifications have been made to implement the Nabokovian mockery of Freud and his psychoanalytic theories on neurosis and expectant fear. As the novel represents this theme through Humbert's interiority, the medium of film asks for a different way of its portrayal, namely, through the exteriority and actions of Quilty. Thus, Kubrick added the roles of Dr Zempf and the mystery caller to represent and ridicule Freud's theory on neurosis via the exteriority of Quilty's character. As Dr Zempf, he becomes a mocking representation of the stereotypical German psychologist and ridicules Freud's theory of neurosis by means of his diagnosis of her standard teenage behaviour as the symptoms of a repressed libido. Additionally, his lecherous description of Lolita belittles and ridicules the importance that Freud attributes to sex in his theories. This mocking representation of Freud's psychoanalysis in Kubrick's film therefore adheres to Nabokov's view of Freud as an eroticist and vulgar reductionist. Moreover, Quilty's threats of police involvement in Humbert sex life, when he is 'disguised' as the mysterious midnight caller in the film resembles Freud's continual pursuit of Humbert in the novel. Also, his final joke of "afraid is Freudian lingo" refers to the relation between general anxiety and a suppressed libido. Lastly, the different personas and accents employed by Peter Sellers is Kubrick's way of inserting Nabokov's motto: "Freudians, Keep Out". By means of the theme's transposition from Humbert's interiority in the novel to Quilty's actions and appearance in the film, Kubrick shows how film's preference for action can visualise Freud's theories and Nabokov's disdain of Freud in a great manner.

Thirdly, the addition of Vivian Darkbloom as Quilty's companion and the two subsequent dance scenes between either Charlotte and Quilty or Charlotte and Humbert emphasise the role of Quilty as Humbert's psychological double. Moreover, the comical

improvisations by Peter Sellers, such as Roman ping pong which is a game of doubles, further build up the visualisation of Quilty as Humbert's parodic double. Also, his nervous behaviour combined with his unrestrained use of the word "normal" show his role as the personification of Humbert's interiority, namely, his fear and guilt. Ultimately, Quilty's portrayal as Humbert's sexual rival and messenger of death combined with the latter's conscious ignorance of Quilty's existence as the repression of his paedophilic urges adheres to the characteristics of the psychological double as described by Sigmund Freud and his apprentice Otto Rank. As in the second chapter, Kubrick shows how the visual and auditory aspects of film present with great result, the Freudian notion of the psychological double as "the return of negation" or "the repressed" and effectively visualises Humbert's interiority in the externality of Quilty's character. He achieves this by adding the two dance scenes, the character of Vivian Darkbloom and allowing Peter Sellers to go to great length with his comical improvisations.

Finally, this research was not without its limitations. As I was not extremely well versed in psychology or Freud for that matter, the time limit of ten weeks for this thesis was not enough to immerse myself as fully in the intricate world of Freud, and his psychoanalytic theories and case-studies, as I would have wanted. Thus, as only a few of Freud's theories have been discussed in this paper, I feel that much more can be learned from this wonderful film adaptation in terms of its visual representation of such a complex field as psychoanalysis. Therefore, I would suggest for further research to look for other theories of Freud that are represented in Kubrick's film, perhaps also in other characters: for example, in Lolita or her mother Charlotte, as this research has only focused on the male characters of the plot.

Works Cited

- Abrams, Nathan. "Kubrick's Double: *Lolita*'s Heart of Jewishness." *Cinema Journal* 55.3 (2016): 17-39. *Project MUSE*. Web. 11 Jan. 2018.
- Appel, Jr., Alfred. "Introduction." *The Annotated Lolita*. London: Penguin Modern Classics. 20-79. *Google Books*. Web. 14 Dec. 2017.
- . *Nabokov's Dark Cinema*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974. Print.
- Berman, Jeffrey. *The Talking Cure*. 1985. Chevy Chase: International Psychotherapy Institute, 2015. Print.
- Blackwell, Stephen H. "Nabokov's Wiener-Schnitzel Dreams: Despair and Anti-Freudian Poetics." *Nabokov Studies* 7 (2003): 129-50. *Project MUSE*. Web. 4 Jan. 2018.
- Burns, Dan E. "Pistols and Cherry Pies: *Lolita* From Page to Screen." *Literature/Film Quarterly* 12.4 (1984): 245-50. *JSTOR*. Web. 2 Nov. 2017.
- Butler, Stephen H. "*Lolita* and the Modern Experience of Beauty." *Studies in the Novel* 18.4 (1986): 427-37. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Sept. 2017.
- Connolly, Julian W. "Nature's Reality or Humbert's Fancy? Scenes of Reunion and Murder in *Lolita*." *Nabokov Studies* 2 (1955): 41-61. *Project MUSE*. Web. 9 Nov. 2017.
- Cummins, George. "Nabokov's Russian *Lolita*." *The Slavic and East European Journal* 21.3 (1977): 354-65. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 Nov. 2017.
- Delage-Toriel, Lara. "Shadow of a Double: Taking a Closer Look at the Opening of Kubrick's *Lolita*." *Miranda* 3 (2010): 1-8. *Open Edition Journals*. Web. 9 Nov. 2017.
- Durantaye, de la, Leland. "Vladimir Nabokov and Sigmund Freud, or a Particular Problem." *American Imago* 62.1 (2005): 59-73. *Project MUSE*. Web. 5 Jan. 2018.
- Egan, Danielle R., and Gail Hawkes. *Theorizing the Sexual Child in Modernity*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010. Print.
- Falsetto, Mario. *Stanley Kubrick: A Narrative and Stylistic Analysis*. London: Praeger, 2001.

Print.

Freud, Sigmund. "Part Three: General Theory of the Neuroses. XXV. Fear and Anxiety." A

General Introduction to Psychoanalysis. Trans. by G. Stanley Hall. Adelaide: The

University of Adelaide, 2014. *Ebooks@Adelaide*. Web. 16 Jan. 2018.

--. "Sigmund Freud on Psychoanalysis." *Britannica*. Encyclopaedia Britannica,

Inc., 6 Nov. 2014. Web. 31 Jan. 2018.

--. "The Origin and Development of Psychoanalysis." *The American Journal of*

Psychology 21.2 (1910): 181-218. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Jan. 2018.

Frosch, Thomas R. "Parody and Authenticity in *Lolita*." *Vladimir Nabokov's Lolita: A*

Casebook. Eds. by Ellen Pifer. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003. 39-56.

Google Books. Web. 14 Dec. 2017.

Gabbard, Krin. "The Circulation of Sadomasochistic Desire in the *Lolita* Texts." *Journal of*

Film and Video 46.2 (1994): 19-30. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 Nov. 2017.

Goldman, Eric. "'Knowing' *Lolita*: Sexual Deviance and Normality in Nabokov's *Lolita*."

Nabokov Studies 8 (2004): 87-104. *Project MUSE*. Web. 9 Dec. 2017.

Holmlund, Christina. "Sexuality and Power in Male Doppelgänger Cinema: The Case of

Clint Eastwood's "Tightrope".' *Cinema Journal*. 26.1 (1986): 31-42. *JSTOR*. Web. 22

Jan. 2018.

Hutcheon, Linda and Siobhan O'Flynn. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Taylor and

Francis, 2013. *ProQuest Ebook Central*. Web. 14 Dec. 2017.

Ingham, John M. "Primal Scene and Misreading in Nabokov's *Lolita*." *American Imago*

59.1 (2002): 27-52. *Project MUSE*. Web. 9 Dec. 2017.

Krutnik, Frank. *In a Lonely Street: Film Noir, Genre, Masculinity*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Print.

Kubrick, Stanley. "Words and Movies." *Sight & Sound* 30 (1961): 14. *The Kubrick Site*.

- Web. 20 Jan. 2018.
- Lolita*. Screenplay by Vladimir Nabokov. Dir. by Stanley Kubrick. Perf. by James Mason, Sue Lyon, Shelley Winters and Peter Sellers. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1962. Film.
- McDonald, James L. "John Ray, Jr., Critic and Artist: The Foreword to *Lolita*." *Studies in the Novel* 5.3 (1973): 352-357. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 Dec. 2017.
- McLeod, Saul. "Psychoanalysis." *Simply Psychology*. Simply Psychology, 2014. Web. 31 Jan. 2018.
- Nabokov, Vladimir. *Lolita*. 1955. London: Penguin Modern Classics, 2011. Print.
- Pilińska, Anna. *Lolita between Adaptation and Interpretation: From Nabokov's Novel and Screenplay to Kubrick's Film*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015. *ProQuest Ebook Central*. Web. 29 Dec. 2017.
- Power, Elizabeth. "The Cinematic Art of Nympholepsy: Movie Star Culture as Loser Culture in Nabokov's *Lolita*." *Criticism* 41.1 (1999): 101-118. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 Nov. 2017.
- Ransom, Amy J. "Opening Eyes Wide Shut: Genre, Reception, and Kubrick's Last Film." *Journal of Film and Video*. 62.4 (2010): 31-46. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Jan. 2018.
- Rosenfield, Claire. "The Shadow within: The Conscious and Unconscious Use of the Double." *Daedalus*. 92.2 (1963): 326-344. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Jan. 2018.
- Schweighauser, Philipp. "Discursive Killings: Intertextuality, Aestheticization, and Death in Nabokov's *Lolita*." *American Studies* 44.2 (1999): 255-67. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Nov. 2017.
- Trubikhina, Julia, and Eiiulieiiia Kunina. *The Translator's Doubts: Vladimir Nabokov and the Ambiguity of Translation*. Brighton: Academic Studies Press, 2015. *ProQuest Ebook Central*. Web. 2 Jan. 2018.
- Vardoulakis, Dimitris. "The Return of Negation: The Doppelganger in Freud's "The 'Uncanny'".' *SubStance* 35.2 (2006): 100-16. *Project MUSE*. Web. 20 Jan. 2018.

Appendix A – Transcripts of Stanley Kubrick’s 1962 Film Adaptation of *Lolita*

I. School Psychologist Dr Zemph

Humbert (H): Lo?

Quilty disguised as Dr Zemph (Q): Good evening, Dr Humbert.

H: O... Who are you?

Q: I am Dr Zemph. Dr Humbert, I am pleased to meet you. I am the Beardsley High School psychologist.

H: Have you been here...? I mean, err, how did you get in?

Q: Your little daughter opened the door to me on the way to her piano lesson and she said I was to wait in here until your arrival. So here I am.

H: Sit down. Make yourself at home.

Q: I sat in the dark so as to save you the expense of the electricity. Ha-ha-ha.

H: That was very considerate of you.

Q: A great pleasure.

H: What can I do for you, Dr Zemph?

Q: Dr Humbert, would you mind if I am putting to you the blunt question?

H: No, by all means do so.

Q: We are wondering, has anybody instructed Lolita in the facts of life?

H: -The facts?

Q: The facts of life. You see, Lolita is a sweet, little child... but the onset of maturity seems to be giving her a certain amount of trouble.

H: I really don't think that this is a fit topic.

Q: Well, Dr Humbert, to you she is still the little girl what is cradled in the arms... but to those boys over there at the Beardsley High... She is a lovely girl, you know mit, mit, mit, mit the swing, you know, and the jazz and she has got the curvatures which they take a lot of notice

of. You and I, what are we? We are symbols of power, sitting in our offices there. We are making the signatures, writing the contracts and the decisions all the time. But if we cast our minds back... Just think, what were we only yesterday? Yesterday, Dr Humbert... you and I were little High School Jim and we were carrying High School Jane's schoolbooks. You remember those days? Ah.

H: In point of fact, Dr Zemph, I am a lecturer in French literature.

Q: I have not made my point quite clear. I have some other details which I would like to put to you, Dr Humbert. "She is defiant and rude. Sighs a good deal in the class." She sighs, makes the sound of... "Chews gum vehemently." All the time she is chewing this gum. "Handles books gracefully." That doesn't really matter. "Voice is pleasant. Giggles rather often and is excitable." She giggles at things. "A little dreamy. Concentration is poor." She looks at the book for a while and then she gets fed up with it. "Has private jokes of her own." Which no one understands so they can't enjoy them with her." She either has exceptional control or she has no control at all." We cannot decide which. Added to that, just yesterday, Dr Humbert... she wrote a most obscene word with the lipstick, if you please... on the health pamphlet. And so, in our opinion, she is suffering from acute repression of the libido of the natural instincts.

H: I fail to see the significance of all this as far as her record as a student is concerned, Dr Zemph.

Q: We Americans, we are progressively modern. We believe that it is equally important to prepare the pupils for the mutually satisfactory mating and the successful child rearing. That is what we believe.

H: What do you suggest?

Q: I am suggesting that Dr Cutler, who is the district psychologist to the Board of Education, should visit you in the home with his three-member board of psychologists and once they are in the home they can investigate thoroughly in the home situation, with all four of them.

H: The home situation?

Q: So that they can get straight at the source of the repression.

H: But she's not being repressed, Dr Zempf.

Q: Do I take it then that you are refusing to cooperate with Dr Cutler and his men?

H: I am not refusing anything at all, but please understand me. No, I don't want to—

Q: What? What are you saying then?

H: I absolutely refuse to have a quartet of strange psychologists nosing around my house.

Q: Dr Humbert, I'm afraid that... you may have no choice. Cigarette?

H: No choice?

Q: No choice. Keep the pack. Look, Dr Humbert, I don't wish to take this to a higher level of authority, if I can possibly help it. Understand?

H: I should hope not.

Q: So, you must help me.

H: What can I do?

Q: I don't know, but perhaps there is another approach that we can take... something new altogether, some new approach. What would you say? Would you like that? Some new area of adjustment that Lolita could find... perhaps by taking a larger share of the extracurricular school activities?

H: I have never objected to her taking part in the extracurricular...

Q: School activities.

H: Pardon me.

Q: You see, we have questioned Lolita on the home situation... but she says not a word, stays with her lips buttoned up. So, we are speaking with her friends, and they are saying things, which I wouldn't repeat to you here. But there is one thing which has arisen from this which is quite clear: That you, Dr Humbert, should definitely un-veto that girl's nonparticipation in the school play.

H: All right, perhaps I was wrong in the attitude that I took about the school play.

Q: That's very big of you to admit that. While you're at it... why don't you also loosen up a bit more on the other two D's... the "dating" und the "dance"?

H: Do you think that those are equally important?"

Q: Dr Humbert, I tell you what I do think. I feel that you and I should do all in our power to stop that old Dr Cutler and his quartet of psychologists from fiddling around in the home situation. That's what I feel. Don't you agree with me?

II. The Mysterious Midnight Call

Humbert (H): Hello?

Quilty (Q): Hello. Is that Professor Humbert?

H: Yes.

Q: How are you, Professor?

H: I'm.... Who is this, please?

Q: I'm sort of really sorry to disturb you. I hope I really haven't woken you at this terribly late hour. I was wondering if you'd been enjoying your stay... in our lovely little town here.

H: Who's this calling?

Q: My name.... It doesn't really matter. It's really an obscure and unremarkable name... you understand, Professor. But my department is sort of concerned, sort of concerned with the bizarre rumours that have been circulating about you and the lovely, remarkable girl you've

been travelling with.

H: Look, I'm very much afraid you'll have to identify yourself because this conversation is becoming more and more preposterous.

Q: Professor, now tell me something... I guess all this travelling around you do, you don't get much time to see a psychiatrist regularly, is that right?

H: I have no psychiatrist, and I don't need a psychiatrist!

Q: I'll tell you why I ask. You see, you're classified in our files, Professor... you're classified in our files as a white, widowed male. I wonder if you'd be prepared to give our investigator... a report, Professor, on your current sex life, if any.

H: I don't know who you are, and I certainly have no interest... in your investigators so I'm afraid that you will have to terminate this conversation.

Q: Professor, "afraid" is Freudian lingo—

H: hangs up the phone.

III. The Veranda Scene

Quilty (Q): Hello. Ha ha. Heh. Hello.

Humbert (H): Ah, you're addressing me. I thought perhaps there was someone with you.

Q: No, I'm not really with someone. I'm with you. Heh heh. I didn't mean that as an insult.

What I really meant was that I'm with the state police here, and when I'm with them, I'm with someone, but right now, I'm on my own. I mean I'm not with a lot of people, just you. Heh.

H: Well, I wouldn't like to disturb you. I'll, err, leave you alone if you prefer it.

Q: No, you don't really have to go at all. I like it, you know, because, err, I don't know what it is, I sort of get the impression you want to leave but you don't like to leave because you think I'd think it looks suspicious, me being a policeman and everything. You don't have to think that because I haven't really got a suspicious mind at all. I look suspicious myself. A lot of people think I'm suspicious, especially when I stand around on street corners. One of our

own boys picked me up the other week. He thought that I was too suspicious standing on the street corner and everything. Tell me something, err, I couldn't help noticing when you checked in tonight... It's part of my job, I notice human individuals and I noticed your face. I said to myself when I saw you: there's a guy with the most normal-looking face I ever saw in my life.

H: That's very nice of you to say that.

Q: Not a bit, not a bit. It's great to see a normal face because I'm a normal guy. It'd be great for two normal guys like us to get together and talk about world events, you know, in a normal sort of way.

H: There's nothing I would like better than that, but I don't have much time.

Q: O, it's a pity, because, uh, may I say one other thing to you? It's running on my mind, I've been thinking about it quite a lot. I noticed when you was checking in you had a lovely, pretty little girl with you. She was really lovely. As a matter of fact, she wasn't so little, come to think of it. She was fairly tall, well, I mean, taller than little, you know what I mean, but, uh, she was really lovely. I wish I had a lovely, pretty, tall, lovely little girl like that, I mean...

H: Well, err, that was my daughter.

Q: Your daughter? Gee, isn't it great to lovely, tall, pretty, little, small daughter like that? It's really wonderful. I don't have any children or boys or little tall girls, or anything, I'm not even— Are *you* married?

H: Yes, I'm expecting my wife, perhaps, to join us here.

Q: May I say something? I thought you was looking a little uneasy at the desk there and maybe I was thinking you want to get away from your wife for a little while. I don't blame you. If I was married I'd take every opportunity to get away from my wife.

H: Yes. No, that was not it at all. Err, as a matter of fact, it's quite possible my wife will not join me because when I left home she was not very well.

Q: Oh gee. What was the matter with your wife?

H: It's not import—she had an accident.

Q: Oh gee. She had an accident. That's really terrible, I mean, fancy a fellow's wife, a normal guy's wife, having an accident like that. What-err-what happened to her?

H: She was hit by a car.

Q: Gee, no wonder she's not here. Gee, you must feel pretty bad about that. W-w-when, err, w-w-what's happening? Is she coming on later, or something?

H: Well, that was the understanding.

Q: What, in an ambulance? Ha ha. Gee, I'm sorry, I—I shouldn't say that. I get sort of carried away, you know, being so normal and everything. Tell me, er, when you were standing there at the desk checking in with the night manager Mr. George Swine, who I happen to know as a personal friend of mine, I was wondering if he fixed you up with a sort of good accommodation here.

H: Yes, they were extremely cooperative.

Q: You quite sure about that? Because I could really easily have a word with George Swine, I mean, he's a really normal, nice sort of guy and I've only got to have a normal word in his ear and you'd be surprised what things could happen from a thing like that. I mean, he'd probably go and turn some of the troopers out, so you could have a lovely room, a bridal suite, for you and your lovely little girl.

H: No, please, I don't want you to take any trouble on my account. We're perfectly comfortable.

Q: But he should do it, it's his job to fix you up with something nice. I mean, he gets paid for doing that thing and when he sees a guy like you coming in, all normal and everything, with a lovely little girl beside him, he should to himself: Gee, I gotta give that a lovely sort of comfortable, foamy bed to sleep in. I mean, you know, I just don't like to hear things like that

happening, because I could go over and really take a swipe at him for not giving you a lovely, comfortable, sleepy, movie-star bed. You know what I mean? Heh. I mean, you know, what has he got you on, the floor or something?

H: Well, the little girl is probably already asleep in the bed and... Well, I don't know why we are discussing this—

Q: Listen, why don't you have let me have a look at the accommodation that you have now and really take it in for a second, then I can come down and have a word with George Swine. It would be so simple.

H: No, you really shouldn't worry about either of us. Which reminds me, I think that I should go upstairs now—

Q: You're going because you maybe think that me being a policeman and everything, I'd think you're sort of suspicious? Heh. I don't think that at all. I think you're really normal and everything. You don't have to go because of that.

H: No, I— It's been very nice talking to you.

Q: Yeah, er, listen. Before you go, I was wondering whether, maybe in the morning, you know, me being lonely and normal and everything—

H: No, we shall have to get up at the crack of dawn.

Q: —have breakfast with me perhaps, would you like that?

H: That's very nice of you, but—

Q: I can arrange it with George Swine, the night manager. He could have it laid out already.

H: Well, thank you so much. Good night.

Q: You have a most interesting face. Good night.

Appendix B: Stills from Stanley Kubrick's 1962 Film Adaptation of *Lolita*



Figure 1 - Foreground-background shot: Quilty and Vivian mirror Humbert and Lolita (1:15:07)



Figure 2 - Foreground-background shot: Quilty and Vivian mirror Humbert and Lolita (1:15:47)



Figure 3 - Foreground-background shot: Quilty and Vivian hide from Humbert behind newspaper (1:18:43)