Much has been written about the genre of the Gothic romance and its special appeal for women. In “Gothic Possibilities,” for example, Norman Holland and Leona Sherman pose the following questions, to be explored in the body of their essay: “How, for example, has a genre like the Gothic maintained its popularity for two centuries? Why are the overwhelming majority of those who read gothics women?” Yet these same observers stress the continuity of the conventions of the genre:

The image of woman-plus-habitation and the plot of mysterious sexual and supernatural threats in an atmosphere of dynastic mysteries within the habitation has changed little since the eighteenth century. Horace Walpole invented, so to speak, the gothic house in *The Castle of Otranto* (1764), and Ann Radcliffe brought all the elements of the genre together in *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1791). To be sure, the modern Byronic lover combines the separated hero and villain of the eighteenth century, but that is about the only change.

But any truly historical theory of genre should be able to suggest some explanations for that change, and for others as well. This paper, then, will focus on the Gothic romance film of the 1940s, its place within the Gothic genre, and the relationship between its textual variations and the historical situation of American women. For although the Gothic mode has always permitted the articulation of feminine fear, anger, and distrust of the patriarchal order, the films of the war and post-war period place an unusual emphasis on the affirmation of feminine perception, interpretation, and lived experience.

In the period from 1940 to 1948, Gothic romance films were produced by almost every Hollywood studio, utilizing some of their most prestigious directors and top box-office performers. The plots of films like *Rebecca*, *Suspicion*, *Gaslight*, and their lesser-known counterparts like *Undercurrent* and *Sleep My Love* fall under the rubric of the Gothic designation: a young inexperienced woman meets a handsome older man to whom she is alternately attracted and repelled. After a
whirlwind courtship (72 hours in Lang's *Secret Beyond the Door*, two weeks is more typical), she marries him. After returning to the ancestral mansion of one of the pair, the heroine experiences a series of bizarre and uncanny incidents, open to ambiguous interpretation, revolving around the question of whether or not the Gothic male really loves her. She begins to suspect that he may be a murderer.

That Hollywood should turn to a genre popular with women during the 40s is certainly not surprising: as Leo Handel argues in *Hollywood Looks at Its Audience*, many people connected with the film industry were under the impression that audiences were mainly composed of women, and this “resulted in the fact that some motion picture companies catered to the tastes of female patrons both in their productions and in their promotional campaigns.”6 And although the preconditions for Gothic narratives certainly predate the 1940s (for example, the “woman plus habitation” motif may be related to the bourgeois separation between productive and reproductive realms, with its restriction of women to the domestic sphere, the extraordinary sexual anxiety of Gothic heroines to the sexual ignorance in which bourgeois women were kept), certain material conditions of the period may have suggested the Gothic, with its emphasis on sexuality and domesticity, as a particularly viable genre for what Fredric Jameson has described as generic “refashioning” and “reappropriation.”7

Writing at the beginning of the decade, in “The Role of Women in This Culture” (1941), Clara Thompson argued: “Our problem with women today is not simply that they are caught in a patriarchal culture, but that they are living in a culture in which the positive gains for them are failing.”8 Referring to the fact that industry had been taken out of the home and that large families were no longer desired or economically possible, she cited the emotional factors contributing to the housewife’s dissatisfaction: the home is no longer the center of the husband’s life, and the woman finds herself without occupation and with an unsatisfactory emotional life. On the other hand, the culture was beginning to offer a life outside the home for women, and birth-control knowledge and openness about sex were challenging the domination of sexual life by puritanical ideas. The conflict—the clash between old attitudes and training and the new—marked this as a transitional period for women.9

This conflict was to be exacerbated in the rest of the decade, as women joined or gained access to higher-paying positions within the labor market during the war and then were re-routed back to the home after the Armistice. It is this situation—of role redefinition, frustration, and confusion—which forms the background set for the Gothic romance films of the 40s. Add to this the rash of hasty pre-war mar-
riages (and the subsequent all-time high divorce rate of 1946), the increase in early marriages in the 40s, and the process of wartime separation and reunion, factors which gave the “marrying a stranger” motif of the Gothics a specific historical resonance.  

But this still tells us little of the specific variations of the 40s filmic Gothics, and the way in which these historical circumstances may have foregrounded certain generic possibilities and excluded others. Several of the films make specific reference to their time of production; for example in Undercurrent (1946), the Gothic male is represented as a war profiteer, and the heroine’s suspicions of him are compounded when she unfavorably contrasts his motives with those of other industrialists. In Secret Beyond The Door (1948), we are told that the husband’s relationship with his first wife fell apart “after the war.” But such specific references are the exception rather than the rule, and consequently we must look elsewhere for an understanding of the relationship of the Gothics to history.

As outlined above, the central feature of the Gothics is ambiguity, the hesitation between two possible interpretations of events by the protagonist and often, in these filmic presentations, by the spectator as well. This it shares with other filmic and literary genres, for example, the horror film and the fantastic. Yet in the Gothic, this hesitation is experienced by a character (and presumably a spectator) who is female. Within a patriarchal culture, then, the resolution of the hesitation carries with it the ideological function of validation or invalidation of feminine experience.

In this context it is instructive to compare the early films like Rebecca (1940) and Suspicion (1941) with the later films of the war and post-war years. In Rebecca, the major portion of the narrative hinges upon the heroine’s assumption that her husband was so in love with his first wife that she can never hope to be anything but a meager substitute. The narrative provides adequate justification for this assumption: the tauntings of Mrs. Danvers, or Maxim’s abrupt changes of mood at the mention of anything remotely connected with Rebecca. Yet the discovery of Rebecca’s body provokes the disclosure: Maxim didn’t love Rebecca; he hated her. This disclosure is accompanied by a crash of cymbals on the soundtrack, and a subsequent cut to a long shot of the second Mrs. de Winter, tracking in to a medium shot which reveals her enraptured expression. As Maxim continues to narrate the story of his “hellish” marriage to Rebecca, laced with allusions to her promiscuity, cruelty, and lesser vices (such as smoking cigarettes), we return to the second wife’s smiling reaction: “You didn’t love her . . . you didn’t love her.” Thus the heroine’s happiness is purchased at the price of the invalidation of her independent judgment.
Suspicion actually thematizes the problematic nature of the heroine’s perception. Lina’s glasses function to characterize her as a dowdy “spinster,” but they also function symbolically in the text as a figure of perception, linking sight with understanding and insight, representing the split between the active (seeing) and the passive (being seen) aims of the drive. The opening sequences of the film present Lina first with and then without her glasses, an undesirable and then desirable object from Johnny’s point of view. This initiates an opposition which will continue throughout the film. Lina removes her glasses when she wants to be seen by Johnny as desirable (for example, Lina takes off her glasses upon Johnny’s arrival at her parents’ house; a second time, metonymically, when she comes across his picture in a magazine)—as such she is “blind” to his behavior. On the other hand, Lina puts on her glasses when she wants to see—at such times she receives insight into Johnny’s character (for example, she puts on her glasses and reads Johnny’s letter to Milbeck, which reveals that he owes a great sum of money; later she reads a reply to Johnny’s request to borrow money against her life insurance policy). However, since at the end of the film Lina’s perceptions are invalidated, the film attempts to resolve the story in favor of the passive aim, implying that she would have been better off had she stuck to being seen.

The problematic nature of feminine perception of male behavior is underscored by the presentation of gestures which are ambiguously sexual or violent. As spectators we are placed in a similar position to Lina vis-à-vis Johnny’s behavior even when his actions are not presented optically from her point of view. Fairly early in the film an extreme long shot depicts the struggling couple on the top of a hill, accompanied by ominous music on the soundtrack. This is followed by a closer shot of the pair, as Johnny asks, “What do you think I was trying to do—kill you?” and claims, “I was trying to fix your hair.” We have been encouraged by the camera distance (we literally cannot see what is going on) and the music on the soundtrack to assume that the heroine is in danger, yet the film clearly associates Lina’s fear of Johnny with her sexual fears and frigidity. The sexual imagery of Lina snapping her purse shut has often been noted; Johnny will refer back to this incident in which “you wouldn’t let me unbutton your blouse,” in a much later sequence in which Lina shivers as he starts to undress her (having now fully suspected him of both Beaky’s murder and her own in the future). Again, since Lina’s (and our) suspicions about Johnny are ultimately denied, spectators may have been encouraged to read the film as the working through of a childish woman’s sexual anxiety, especially with regard to then circulating psychoanalytic theory. For example, Marie Bonaparte viewed women’s sexual anxiety
as an abnormality which derives from the infantile sadistic conception of coitus, that is, the sexual act perceived as an act of sadistic aggression perpetrated by the male upon the female.\textsuperscript{15} According to this view, in normal development, then, boys learn to distinguish “aggressivity from sadism,” and girls “passivity from masochism,”\textsuperscript{16} although there may be some masochism inherent in feminine sexuality:

It is true that in woman’s acceptance of her role there may be a slight tincture—a homeopathic dose, so to speak—of masochism, and this, combining with her passivity in coitus, impels her to welcome and to value some measure of brutality on the man’s part.\textsuperscript{17}

This view assumes that the infantile conception is a misperception, which somehow must be corrected for the woman to reach maturity; it never questions the cultural context which enables the child to make such an interpretation in the first place. If we, as film spectators, mistake the erotic for the violent, those perceptions, too, will be corrected in the course of the film.

Unlike its original source, in \textit{Suspicion} the ambiguity of Johnny’s behavior is maintained until the last few minutes of the film when Johnny provides an alternate explanation for his suspicious behavior: he may be a spendthrift, a liar and a cheat, but not a murderer. What is more, Lina is made to blame herself for her suspicions: “If I’d been really close to you, you could have confided in me: if I’d only understood.” Although Lina’s point of view has been adopted for the bulk of the narrative, it is rendered false by Johnny’s explanation in the final sequence. As in \textit{Rebecca}, the unusual emphasis on the point of view of the heroine has been put to the service of the invalidation of feminine perception and interpretation, equating feminine subjectivity with some kind of false consciousness, as the male character “corrects” the heroine’s false impressions.

Considering the way in which the evidence had been accumulating and pointing in precisely the opposite direction, this ending strikes one as completely unsatisfactory and contrived, although some observers have sought to impose a unity on the film as it stands.\textsuperscript{18} Hitchcock’s preferred ending and his problems with RKO are well-known, and one need not repeat them here.\textsuperscript{19} However, the point to be made is that the sloppy and unsatisfying conclusion to the film was mentioned by \textit{every} contemporary reviewer (for example, “... so nothing happens except that a quick twist at the end explains everything to her satisfaction, if not the audience’s”),\textsuperscript{20} contributing to the context of the film’s reception. Thus the claim that viewers may have rejected this ending, and possibly the patriarchal ideology which underlies it, is not merely retrospective theorizing.

If we turn now to the Gothics of the war and post-war years, we
see the trend initiated by the unmotivated ending of *Suspicion* brought to its logical conclusion: an affirmation of feminine experience. In every film from *Shadow of a Doubt* (1943) to *Sleep My Love* (1948), the heroine’s suspicions about the Gothic male are confirmed. This represents a substantial departure from the 19th century Gothics, the earlier films in the cycle, and the modern Gothics and contemporary romances where the moody Byronic lover emerges as someone who truly loves the heroine. For example, in the modern Gothics analyzed by Joanna Russ, the cruel Satanic type is “invariably guiltless” while a gentler, kinder man is actually the villain, perhaps “an insane mass-murderer of a whole string of previous wives.”21 In these more conservative works, as Tania Modleski has argued, moody, scornful, cruel and sadistic behavior is thematized as problematic for women, but it is eventually naturalized as simply part of being male, in fact evidence of the man’s love for the heroine.22 In the war and post-war Gothics, on the other hand, such sentiments may constitute delays which keep the narrative going. For example, in the following passage from the novel *Dragonwyck*, the heroine attempts to rationalize her husband’s behavior and her doubts about him:

For a moment she knew doubt, but only for a moment, then her consuming desire to believe in her essential goodness reassured her. Men were always embarrassed by reference to their brave deeds; to minimize them even with anger was natural.

Oh, why do I ever doubt him, she thought, just because he is a man and hides his tenderness?23

But finally these bits of “common knowledge,” predicated upon patriarchal ideology, are proved wrong: this is not just a “man”; this is a maniac.

Films like *Gaslight* (1944), *Experiment Perilous* (1944) and *Sleep My Love* (1948) actually dramatize the attempts of a patriarchal order to achieve hegemony over feminine perception and interpretation. In these films the husbands are systematically attempting to drive their wives insane, through manipulation of visual and auditory perception (the husband in *Gaslight* dims the lights and walks about the attic, achieving effects he later denies; in *Sleep My Love*, the husband also employs drugs, hypnosis, and a phony psychiatrist to confirm his own diagnosis of his wife’s mental illness), telling the women they forget things or imagine them, and in general, attempting to negate their experience. The plots of these films are similar to the process of interpersonal invalidation described by R. D. Laing in *The Politics of Experience*:

Jack may act upon Jill in many ways. He may make her feel guilty for keeping on “bringing it up.” He may invalidate her experience. This can
be done more or less radically. He can indicate merely that it is unimportant or trivial, whereas it is important and significant to her. Going further, he can shift the modality of her experience from memory to imagination: “It’s all in your imagination.” Further still, he can invalidate the content: “It never happened that way.” Finally, he can invalidate not only the significance, modality and content, but her capacity to remember at all, and make her feel guilty for doing so into the bargain. This is not unusual. People are doing such things to each other all the time. In order for each transpersonal invalidation to work, however, it is advisable to overlay it with a thick patina of mystification. For instance, by denying that this is what one is doing, and further invalidating any perception that it is being done by ascriptions such as “How can you think such a thing?” “You must be paranoid,” and so on.24

Although Laing does not seem to perceive it as such25 (note, for example, the shift from “Jack and Jill” and “he and she” to “People are doing such things to each other”), he is describing a form of interpersonal relationship occurring most frequently within patriarchal structures of power and dependency, dominance and submission.

A necessary condition for the husband’s success or failure in invalidating the heroine’s experience is his ability to isolate her within the nuclear family, literally within the house. When the couple first returns to the house in Gaslight, the camera is placed inside the hallway so as to offer a view from inside. As Gregory shuts the front door, he shuts out the daylight and turns on the gaslight. This is the beginning of an opposition which will be established between daylight and gaslight, outside and inside, with the house representing stifling gloom and oppression and the outside world the only hope for Paula’s salvation. Gregory attempts to isolate Paula within the house with the rhetoric of the loving and over-indulgent husband; he denies her request to give a party with the claim that he would rather be alone with her, have a “honeymoon a little bit longer,” and all his subsequent attempts to prevent her from going out or receiving visitors are defended by concern for her health and welfare. Conversely, her health and sanity are associated with leaving the house and seeing other people besides her husband. In an important sequence in which Paula attempts to fight back against her restriction and confinement within the house, she confronts her husband: “I am quite well . . . I must get out of the house . . . see people . . . find out what’s going on in the world.” The final scene of the film, concurrent with the heroine’s liberation, takes place out of the house, up on the roof.

With its emphasis on the ambivalence or abhorrence of the heroine toward the house itself, especially as expressed above, the war-time Gothic comes close to voicing a critique of the sexual division
of labor of the bourgeois family, with its restriction of women to the domestic sphere. As such it stands as an interesting contrast to the “family films” of the same period, like Meet Me in St. Louis (1944) and I Remember Mama (1948), films which also find their center in the domestic space of the Victorian house. Here the space of the house is anything but oppressive—capable of infinite expansion, the site of intimacy and community.26

These two sides of the Victorian family, represented by the nostalgic family films, on the one hand, and the Gothics on the other, were recognized by researchers concerned about the family’s fate in post-war society. “Our realization that the family is designed for intimacy,” wrote Reuben Hill in Families Under Stress: Adjustment to the Crises of War Separation and Reunion, “brings with it recognition of its reciprocal, the smothering sense of confinement. The latent counterpart of deep affection is known to be disgust and alienation.”27 It is this latter perception of the family to which the Gothics testify.

In light of her isolation, then, we see the importance of corroboration of experience for the Gothic heroine. In Gaslight, Elizabeth, the elderly housekeeper, unlike the evil Mrs. Danvers is sympathetic to the heroine, suspicious of her male employer from the outset. However, she is deaf, which functions as a delay in the resolution of the enigma: she cannot confirm the sounds which Paula is told she “imagines.” This role is reserved for the young and handsome detective, and we note Paula’s excitement as he also hears the footsteps coming from above: “At last I can tell it to someone!” Towards the end of the film Elizabeth beats the husband at his own game, a rare example in these films of feminine solidarity rather than hostility. She refuses to acknowledge the presence of the detective in the house. “You see how it is, Elizabeth,” Gregory says, referring patronizingly to his wife’s mental condition. “Yes sir,” she replies, “I see just how it is.”

But this moment of feminine solidarity is transitory, for as mentioned above, it is a man who corroborates the heroine’s experience, and, in true Gothic tradition, comes to her rescue. This character is a feature of all the Gothics which end with a confirmation of the heroine’s experience; he is young, handsome, usually a detective (in Gaslight or Shadow of a Doubt) or a doctor functioning as one (Experiment Perilous, Dragonwyck).

It is clear that this character serves an important ideological as well as narrative function, perhaps undermining the Gothic’s subversive potential as critique of male domination. By remaining in the background, but remaining a romantic possibility nevertheless, his presence allows the narrative to suggest that the heroine has simply made a bad choice of mate.28 To the contrary, in Angel Street, the
source for *Gaslight*, the detective is an older man with no apparent romantic interest in the heroine, serving merely as a catalyst for her liberation from the tyranny of her husband. The play ends with the detective apologizing: “I came in from nowhere and gave you the most horrible evening of your life. Didn’t I? The most horrible evening of anybody’s life, I should imagine.” She replies, “The most horrible? Oh, no,—the most wonderful.”

In order to promote “the wrong man” ideology, the films must somehow imply that with the second one things will be different. The best way to do this is simply not to allow this romance to progress very far. In one case, at least, the narrative comes dangerously (if unintentionally) close to suggesting that the pattern will be repeated. In *Experiment Perilous*, as in all these films, the Gothic male deceives and manipulates his wife, and this is depicted as part and parcel of his villainy. Yet the hero lies to her as well (although “for her own good”), and even more incredibly, the final sequence of the film presents an idyllic country scene almost identical to an earlier flashback sequence which presented the courtship of the heroine and her *first* husband.

The historical significance of this secondary male character becomes clearer if we return to Hill’s case studies of the 40s family, published in 1949. Some of Hill’s families were “purely patriarchal,” and the relationships described in them are reminiscent of Gothic plots. Such was the case of a prosperous lawyer who would not divorce his wife but “delighted to practice refined mental torture on her. She bore this because there was no other way of providing for the children, and her husband’s departure for the service meant a blessed respite from his cruelty.” However, both researchers and the families themselves were conscious of shifts in family authority, in attitudes toward children, and in what is properly ‘man’s work’ and ‘women’s work,’ not to mention what are father’s duties and mother’s duties in childrearing.” The “majority of the families preferred to think of themselves as modern, that is equalitarian in their family relationships,” but in practice few of the families could be designated as “democratic” ones. For example, of the families in the sample, the largest group considered “husband and wife equal” in a question about the relative dominance of husband and wife; however, the division of labor was predominantly the traditional father-provider, wife-homemaker one. This corroborates the arguments of most historians of the period who state that although the war made a rapid change in the economic status of women, it did not make a lasting or profound difference in the public attitude toward women working, nor in the basic sexual division of labor. Hill used the designation “semi-patriarchal” or “husband-dominant, not purely patriarchal” to describe the structure of these
families.

If the typical American family of the 1940s was "semi-patriarchal," that is, there is some relaxation of the father's authority in the family but the basic sexual division of labor is retained, at least before and after the war, then this helps to explain this particular historical variation in Gothic structure. The shift from denial to affirmation of feminine perspective acknowledges the potential of an alternative or oppositional discourse, perhaps made possible by the exigencies of war-time activities. Yet its power is diffused through the narrative overthrow of the patriarchal tyrant and his replacement by a gentler, more democratic type. Indeed several of the films must motivate the husband's patriarchal behavior by placing the film in an earlier period, Victorian England (Gaslight) or America (Experiment Perilous); or, in Dragonwyck, in the feudal manor system of the Hudson River Valley of the 1840s. Similarly, in the latter film and in Shadow of a Doubt, the Gothic male's misogyny is connected (albeit tenuously) to an inability to come to terms with change of any kind and/or incompatibility with democratic principles.

Thus the heroic male character may be representative of this more modern "semi-patriarchal" type, blunting the subversive edge of Gothic film, a narrative strategy for containing feminine discontent. But, when compared with the resolutions of the earlier films or the later romances, the presence of such a character at least held out the possibility, however utopian, for a model of male sexuality based on something other than brutality, a heterosexual relationship based on something other than male power and dominance, and female anger and distrust.
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