Modern Language Association | MLA

Collaboration and Concepts of Authorship
Author(s): Robert L. Carringer
Reviewed work(s):
Source: *PMLA*, Vol. 116, No. 2 (Mar., 2001), pp. 370-379
Published by: Modern Language Association
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/463523
Accessed: 25/10/2012 04:26

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Modern Language Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *PMLA*.

http://www.jstor.org

theories and methodologies

Collaboration and Concepts of Authorship

ROBERT L. CARRINGER

IT WAS NOT LONG AGO THAT ONE PREFECTURE OF FRENCH CULTURE WAS REINVENTING THE IDEA OF AUTHORSHIP WHILE another one was trying to kill it off. The New Wave movement and poststructuralism, fundamental opposites in almost every respect, emerged at the same cultural moment. Roland Barthes's *Writing Degree Zero* (1953) and François Truffaut's seminal essay in *Cahiers du cinéma* that instated auteur criticism (the first phase of the New Wave) appeared less than a year apart; the appearance of Michel Foucault's *Madness and Civilization* (1961) coincided with the triumph of New Wave filmmaking; and in the interval between 1966 and 1970, which saw the publication of *The Order of Things*, *Of Grammatology*, and *S/Z*, Jean-Luc Godard, the most iconoclastic of the New Wave critic-directors, released fourteen feature films, including four masterworks. In its classic phase poststructuralism was fixated on the written word, involved disciplined thought inflected by mainstream Continental philosophy, took on itself the burden of refashioning modern European history along Marxist lines, and could be uncompromisingly rectitudinous. The New Wave spoke the language of images, involved a loose and—except for its radical stylistics—rather tame avant-gardism, valued an aleatory, free-form aesthetic over political commitment, assailed mainstream French culture, and championed alternative forms of cultural production such as American popular movies. Yet the teleologies were similar: to inscribe a unique place in the history of authorship. To supplant the biographical author from the textual site, one of the primary motives of poststructuralism, was to make the collective space available for a higher entity, the philosopher-critic who is the author not of individual texts but of textuality, the social meaning of texts. In the same way, in claiming the textual site for a film author—a radical conception for the time—the auteur critics scripted a role for themselves that they would subsequently occupy as film directors.

Although both models of authorship have subsequently undergone fundamental alterations, their legacies are still discernible in contemporary critical practice. My concern is with these legacies. I proceed below with alternative readings of a canonical text, each of which ultimately

ROBERT L. CARRINGER is professor of English and film at the University of Illinois, Urbana, and a specialist in United States film history. He has written extensively on the career and films of Orson Welles. His current project is a study of how Los Angeles is constructed as a version of orientalism in the United States cultural imaginary.

© 2001 BY THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

derives from one of the original authorial models. The first is an ambitious queer theory reading of Alfred Hitchcock's 1951 classic *Strangers on a Train*. The second is a reconsideration of the film's queer issues from the perspective of collaborative authorship. Because this authorial model is virtually unknown outside film studies,[1] this treatment will serve as a demonstration and as a means of situating the method within broader considerations of authorship.

[I]

The poststructural litany—language is treacherous, texts are more treacherous, works are always already written, culture serves capital, social formations are instruments of repression—was so eagerly embraced by the United States literary academy that by 1980 the editor of *PMLA* could declare that Derrida and Barthes had supplanted Northrop Frye as the names most often cited in submissions to the journal (Conarroe; Schaefer). Although the antiauthorial themes were gradually undermined, partly by their own internal contradictions (Burke, *Death*) and partly by the emergence of disciplines such as queer, women's, and postcolonial studies, which required authorial canons for self-legitimation, the idea of an author dispossessed of subjectivity reappears in postmodern theory in a new guise, as an authorial figure, an auxiliary to the text, whose presence is invoked even as it is dispossessed of agency. The most conspicuous example is Fredric Jameson, who repeatedly finds delirious obfuscations where others might see stunning bursts of creativity—as when Van Gogh's brilliant colors are said to constitute "some new fragmentation of the emergent sensorium which replicates the specializations and divisions of capitalist life" (7). By now the figure of the auxiliary author has become commonplace, especially in doctrinaire works. Such is the case, as we shall see, with Robert J. Corber's "Hitchcock's Washington: Spectatorship, Ideology, and the 'Homosexual Menace' in *Strangers on a Train*."

The context for Corber's reading is the cold war paranoia that engulfed Washington beginning in 1950. Joseph McCarthy's taunting of the State Department for allegedly harboring Communists dominated the headlines, but other, similar tracks were being pursued. On 28 February, under questioning by the Senate Appropriations Committee, a State Department official revealed that in the previous three years the department had dismissed almost a hundred employees on grounds of homosexuality. Subsequent inquiry by moral zealots in the Senate disclosed that several hundred "moral perverts" were in the employ of the State Department, and the specter of their potential vulnerability to blackmail persuaded the full Senate to authorize an investigation. *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government*, a subcommittee report heavily influenced by medical and psychiatric testimony, declares categorically that such persons are morally and emotionally unstable, as well as security risks, and berates federal agencies for laxity in enforcing termination policies. In a brief introduction, the report lays down several not always compatible principles. The psychiatric position that homosexuality is a clinical disorder is invoked, but while homosexuals may respond to psychiatric treatment and even be cured, it is held that engagement in deviant behavior is a categorical basis for dismissal. The common stereotypes "feminine male" and "masculine female" are rejected as unreliable indicators of whether an individual will engage in homosexual behavior. Two more-inclusive categories, applicable to overt homosexuals of either sex, are substituted: the "active, aggressive, or male" type and the "submissive, passive, or female" type. Of these, the self-concealed "active" gay male poses the greatest threat because he tends to operate undetected as a sexual predator on passive gays and on young men and boys (1–3).[2]

Strangers on a Train was in preparation as these events unfolded, and Corber maintains that Hitchcock's principal changes to Patricia Highsmith's source novel—relocating the action in

Washington and shifting the protagonist's career interest from architecture to politics—are clear evidence of their direct influence. Further, Corber attempts to demonstrate, by means of an extensive matching of events in the film with information in the *Employment* report, that the film "narrativizes" the juridical discourse of the report. He also implements a modified version of male-gaze theory—the subject position is sexually polymorphous, in accord with Freud's interpretation of the preoedipal phase, rather than heterosexually stable, as in most feminist work—to demonstrate that Hitchcock is ambivalent toward his subject at the formal level and possibly homophobic. The strangers are Bruno Anthony (Robert Walker) and Guy Haines (Farley Granger), who meet by accident in the club car of a train. Bruno recognizes Guy, a well-known tennis star, and is aware of his romantic involvement with Anne Morton (Ruth Roman), daughter of a United States senator. Surmising that Guy's present marriage to Miriam (Laura Elliott) stands in the way of his political ambitions, Bruno makes an outrageous proposition—he will dispose of Miriam if Guy will get rid of Bruno's father. The crimes will be perfect, because neither perpetrator will have a connection to his victim. Guy humors Bruno and departs but accidentally leaves behind his cigarette lighter. Bruno infers that Guy has accepted the proposal and takes the lighter as a token of their bond. Bruno waits outside Miriam's house that evening, follows her and two male companions to an amusement park and on a boat ride across a lake to an island where lovers congregate in the dark, and strangles her. Later Bruno accosts Guy outside Guy's Washington apartment and demands that he now carry out his side of the bargain. Bruno becomes increasingly open and brazen in his stalking of Guy, arousing Anne's suspicions. When it becomes clear that Guy will continue to resist, Bruno attempts to frame him by planting the lighter at the scene of the crime. But Guy arrives at the amusement park just in time, and as he and Bruno struggle on a revolving merry-go-round, it whirls out of control and crashes, pinning Bruno beneath the wreckage. As Bruno dies, his clenched fist relaxes and opens to reveal the lighter, implicating him and clearing Guy.

The pampered and indolent Bruno, with his flamboyant clothing—silk pinstripe suit, saddle shoes, outlandish lobster necktie—and purring, aggressively insinuating manner, is, according to Corber, a regression by Hitchcock to the homophobic stereotype, the feminine gay man, the validity of which was questioned even by the report. But, like the report, the film attempts to account for his homosexuality as a psychological abnormality, the result of an unresolved oedipal complex. This is unmistakable when we see Bruno's mother giving her son a manicure as he lounges in an outré silk robe in the sitting room of the family mansion and then, in the background, interceding in his defense against his railing, tyrannical father. To all appearances Guy is the all-American stereotype—an athlete, unassuming despite his fame, conservatively dressed, a person of small-town origins and modest means but strong ambitions. He is the report's most problematic figure—a man of indeterminate sexual identity found in circumstances making him vulnerable to being compromised. The dynamic is visualized in one of the film's most unsettling images—Bruno is seen firmly planted all alone at the top of the steps of the Jefferson Memorial, a dark blot on a field of marble, fixedly returning Guy's stare.

It is Guy's problematic nature that enables Bruno to destabilize the narrative. Although Guy is put off by Bruno's delving into sordid details of his personal life, he nevertheless allows himself to be persuaded to join Bruno for lunch in his private compartment. Corber reads the matter of the lighter as a crucial turn in Guy's psychosexual development. The lighter, a gift from Anne to Guy—it bears the inscription "A to G"—now stands for Guy's redefinition of his relationship with Bruno (Anthony = A), the transfer of Guy's love from Anne to Bruno. In turn, by disposing of Miriam, Bruno will give Anne to

Guy. The homoerotic relationship is now being negotiated through the exchange of a woman. An attempt to heterosexualize Guy is represented by Hitchcock's figure of doubling, as in the lighting and framing of the sequence when Bruno reveals Miriam's murder. In psychoanalytic terms, the doubling suggests Lacan and Freud—the Lacanian psychodrama of the mirror, whereby the male subject passes into the masculine symbolic, and alternatively, in Freud, the advance from the polymorphous sexuality of the preoedipal stage, in which the male subject experiences a "feminine attitude" toward the father, to the oedipal stage, in which he renounces that attraction and compensates for the loss by incorporating the father into his ego (qtd. in Corber 102). Again, the film privileges the report's finding by suggesting that the male subject must successfully negotiate the Oedipus complex to achieve heterosexual identity. Moreover, the male spectator, because he identifies with Guy, is subjected to his own would-be oedipalization whether he will or no.

For Guy, however, the process is incomplete. Although he becomes more forceful, playing tennis with uncharacteristic aggressiveness, then racing to the amusement park to head off Bruno—Guy persists in adopting a "feminine attitude" toward Bruno and refuses to make a choice between him and Anne. Rather, the choice is made for him through the intervention of a deus ex machina, the merry-go-round. Again the report is suggested: Bruno's destabilizing presence in the narrative, like the destabilizing presence of homosexuals in government, can only be removed by violent expulsion. But the film treats this solution as inadequate; Miriam's murder and Bruno's death are both necessary to prevent Guy's homosexualization. What Miriam represents—a heterosexual woman who resists confinement to the domestic sphere—must also be purged. Hence the famous shot in which Miriam's murder, instead of being represented directly, is seen as a distorted reflection in the lenses of her eyeglasses, which have fallen to the ground. The glasses represent Miriam's (and, by extension, the female spectator's) control of the power of looking, the gaze, the control of the visual field that is traditionally the male prerogative. By reappropriating this power—by castrating Miriam, in Lacanian terms—the film returns scopophilic power to the male heterosexual. In formal terms, the heterosexual spectator is inserted in the stable subject position in the cinematic apparatus, the film's underlying operation. The intimation is that stricter regulation of female sexuality is more important to national security than the expulsion of homosexuals.

With this last move, it seems to me, Corber's theoretical apparatus collapses. Not only does Corber abandon the foundation issue of the piece, the negotiation of homosexuality in an inhospitable environment, but he also reverts to the stock version of male-gaze theory he rejected at the outset. The status of the corollary theme, the attempted heterosexualization of the spectator, is equally problematic. In the Jefferson Memorial sequence, he argues, the two shots of Bruno, because seen from Guy's point of view, force the spectator into the subject position of a heterosexual threatened by a homosexual. But how can Guy be preoedipal polymorphous and an embodiment of the stable heterosexual spectatorial position at the same time? And how does a reversal of the situation, a shot from Bruno's point of view when Guy is about to beat Bruno up, advance the heterosexualization of the spectator? Besides, these isolated instances are never shown to be part of an overall strategy at the formal level. Corber's use of historical information, however, presents the most serious problem. When *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government* was issued, on 15 December 1950, the film had already been shot. In fact, the film's basic plan had already been worked out when the subcommittee hearings began the previous June. The production of the film and the investigations were indeed conterminous, but since all hearings were in executive session, it is unclear how Hitchcock could have known what was said even if he had wanted

to. What he could have known were reports carried in the press, under such headlines as "Perverts Called Government Peril," "Inquiry by Senate on Perverts Asked" (W. White), and "Senators Back Morals Probe," while he was at work on the adaptation of Highsmith's novel. These abounded with incendiary quotations but included few details. That events in Washington had a formative impact on *Strangers on a Train* is a brilliant insight, but the invocation of the *Employment* report in this context is chimerical. The theme, as it were, is allowed to author the text; Hitchcock, vacillating and obeisant, serves as an auxiliary. Restoration of the authorial context is the surest corrective to this portrait.

[II]

Auteur criticism was once embraced with the same ardency as poststructuralism. Its central doctrine—films have authors just like novels and plays—served as an aesthetic first principle on which to ground a nascent discipline, had widespread appeal because of its compatibility with literary models, and has since become a habit of thought. But as a methodology it was untenable from the outset. Truffaut's cherished vision of the film director as Romantic artist battling alone to maintain a personal vision in an encroaching world would not hold even for his own films. *The Four Hundred Blows*, which signaled the triumph of the New Wave directors' movement, was an intensely personal film based on the painful experiences of Truffaut's childhood, but its realization necessitated (in addition to financial backing from the director's father-in-law) the use of an experienced screenwriter, a leading cinematographer, and a youthful surrogate, the actor Jean-Pierre Léaud, whose easygoing, self-confident extroversion ran directly counter to the director's shyness and reserve (Baecque and Toubiana 126–36). More recently, the model of the author of a film has been replaced by the model of the *authors* of a film, in recognition of the collaborative nature of the enterprise.[3] Ironically, Truffaut's ideal model of the film auteur was Hitchcock—a director whose almost unbending insistence on regularity of procedure extended to his use of collaborators. At the story development stage, for instance, he began with an existing source work, relied extensively on a trusted associate in the preparation of a scene-by-scene breakdown, brought in a professional to write the scenes, and called in other writers for fine tuning. Once the early breakdown was completed, Hitchcock usually had the film's visual design worked out in his mind. The balance of the scripting process was overseen not by Hitchcock (who was usually involved elsewhere in production logistics) but by an executive assistant who was an accomplished story editor. *Strangers on a Train* evolved according to this plan.

Robert Samuels has astutely observed that every Hitchcock film centrally involves an ethics of representation. A second axiom is also appropriate: every Hitchcock film is predicated on an aesthetics of concealment. Subterfuge is a precondition for any serious artist involved in satisfying the appetites of the American public, but Hitchcock was also personally driven. A petit bourgeois of caring but stern Catholic upbringing, he seems to have got hold of Krafft-Ebing at an impressionable age and been overwhelmed by the experience. (The London tabloids could have produced the same effect.) Hitchcock's film are tableaux of sexual psychopathology that cleverly disavow their motivations—mutually requited incest (*Shadow of a Doubt*), necrophilic fixation (*Vertigo*), vaginal fetishism (*Marnie*), homosexuality (still considered a pathology at the time of *Strangers on a Train*). In the postwar era the Hitchcock inner circle included several gays and bisexuals. One of them, the playwright Arthur Laurents, did the screenplay for *Rope*, in which two gay college students murder their roommate, and sublimated the homosexual content to a degree that satisfied the studio and the Production Code. Expertise in lending deniability to gay content appears, in fact, to have been one of the services Hitchcock required. Lau-

rents recalls, "The actual word *homosexuality* was never said aloud in conferences on *Rope* or on the set, but he alluded to the subject so often—slyly and naughtily, never nastily—that he seemed fixated if not obsessed" (124). Farley Granger—who also played one of the roommates in *Rope*—spoke in similar terms about *Strangers on a Train*: "I don't remember anybody ever saying that [Bruno] was a gay character. I never heard Hitch talk about that, certainly" (71).

This code of silence was observed for many years, even by those who certainly knew better. The gay critic Robin Wood (who came out in a famous essay, "Responsibilities of a Gay Film Critic," in 1978) never mentions the subject in the chapter on *Strangers on a Train* in his landmark study *Hitchcock's Films* (1965). A teasing 1980 review essay in the gay publication *Christopher Street* addresses its readership as if the film's subtextual import has just been discovered for the first time (Aitken).

Hitchcock had acquired the rights to the Highsmith novel early in 1950, and he and Whitfield Cook, a member of the inner circle, worked on the film's scene breakdown throughout the spring. They dispensed with most of Highsmith's novel and completely refashioned the central characters. Highsmith's Bruno is physically repugnant in the extreme, an acute alcoholic, indifferently heterosexual, almost boyish in his admiration of Guy. Guy is defined almost solely by material objects he covets and his architectural ambitions. Hitchcock's Bruno is an elegant, slightly unhinged, but utterly charming roué who is homoerotically attracted to a boyish but rather dim and, except for his athletic prowess, utterly unremarkable Guy. The detective writer Raymond Chandler was engaged to write the script.

It was an unusual choice in two respects—Hitchcock usually did not work with novelists or with writers of Chandler's stature. Still, Hitchcock was desperate for a success, murder mystery was Chandler's specialty, the writer's involvement could be used to promotional advantage, and Warner Brothers was willing to pay. Chandler found screen work distasteful, but the opportunity proved irresistible. Although his novels had sold more than three and a half million copies in the United States alone, his total royalties through 1950 amounted to $56,000. For *Strangers on a Train* he received $40,000 for eight weeks' work (Hiney 193). The relationship was standoffish from the beginning and rapidly deteriorated because of Chandler's lack of confidence in Hitchcock's story plan. Highsmith's story had "one idea," Chandler wrote to his British publisher, "and that was all" (MacShane, *Letters* 224)—the exchange of murders (in the novel Guy actually carries through) and its psychological consequences for the two perpetrators (they exchange personalities and begin to echo each other in sounding like Raskolnikov). Since Guy is no longer going to reciprocate, the situation becomes "ludicrous in its essence," Chandler wrote in an extended script note, and the novelist can find no way (short of outright fraudulence in the exposition) to convince the audience temporarily, as the story situation now requires, that "a perfectly decent young man [. . .] is going to kill anybody," much less "a man he doesn't know, has never seen, in order to keep a maniac from giving himself away" (MacShane, *Life* 172).

Has Chandler missed Hitchcock's drift or only pretended to? By eliminating Guy's reciprocity, Hitchcock has instituted a new story dynamic. Bruno propositions Guy and takes his irresolution as a sign of encouragement. But when Bruno realizes that Guy has no intention of carrying through, his genial wheedling gives way to sadistic vindictiveness. Or, subtextually, a protracted gay cruise becomes a revenge story when the advances are belatedly but summarily rejected. In a characteristic bit of mischief, Hitchcock has the precise turn occur when Guy, feigning assent, goes to the Anthony mansion intending to warn Bruno's father—and finds an enraged Bruno waiting for him in his father's bed. Chandler had good reason for resisting. Just months before, the charge had been made in print that his character Philip Marlowe was a

closet homosexual, and this enraptured description of a male character in *Farewell, My Lovely* was entered into evidence:

> His voice was soft, dreamy, so delicate for a big man that it was startling. It made me think of another soft-voiced big man I had strangely liked. [. . .] I looked at him again. He had the eyes you never see, that you only read about. Violet eyes. Almost purple. Eyes like a girl, a lovely girl. His skin was as soft as silk. [. . .] It would never tan. It was too delicate. He was bigger than Hemingway and younger.

"No matter how 'strangely' [. . .] Marlowe moons over these big men," the critic wrote, "they are always beating him up. [. . .] The true explanation of Marlowe's temperamental disinterest in women is not 'honor,' but his interest in men" (Legman 70; Legman's theme is elaborated in Mason). Chandler had been sent an advance copy of the relevant passages but declined comment. After the book's appearance he wrote to a sympathetic critic, perhaps somewhat unguardedly, that it "leaves a nasty taste in the mouth" (MacShane, *Letters* 188). After this Chandler was never able to re-create the old Philip Marlowe character successfully. Other factors undoubtedly came into play, but the lingering hurt is evident in his final novel, *The Long Goodbye*, when the novelist Roger Wade tells Marlowe, in mock lament, that Wade should have kept on a male secretary so that book reviewers—"all queers, every damn one of them"—would have got the idea he was "a homo" and given him a buildup (209).

Chandler's script draft, which more or less sidestepped the issue, was discarded. Barbara Keon, Hitchcock's executive assistant and story editor, suggested Czenzi Ormonde, her former story assistant on *Gone with the Wind* and at MGM and a longtime dialogue specialist at Samuel Goldwyn, for the rewrite. That Ormonde was an unknown was no particular drawback; the primary necessity, as the experience with Chandler had shown, was an ability to be detached about the homoerotic component. Ormonde's test was the scene of Bruno's manicure, the subtextual implications of which are almost inescapable.[4] Yet Ormonde's dialogue seems oblivious to them—a generalization that could be made about her script in general. That was exactly as Hitchcock wanted it: the director and the actors would convey the subtext. When Chandler saw a copy, he drafted a long letter to Hitchcock stressing (once again) plot mechanics and credibility. He told Hitchcock, in a sarcastic aside, "I think you may be the sort of director who thinks that camera angles, stage business, and interesting bits of byplay will make up for any amount of implausibility in a basic story" (MacShane, *Letters* 244). He was more on target than he knew. Hitchcock's films are designed around what begin as "bits of byplay." Guy and Bruno cross paths at the train station, Guy crosses his legs, the train crosses another pair of tracks as it pulls out of the station, the tennis rackets on Guy's lighter are crossed, and so on. Audiences are primed to expect these visual clues and invited to play along. But as at an overnight party in a haunted-castle movie, the stakes are constantly raised.

In the first shot of the film, the rear door of Bruno's taxicab is hinged at the back and opens from the front. In a matching shot, the rear door of Guy's taxicab opens in the more conventional way, from the back. As was said in Hitchcock's time, One swings one way, one swings the other. Bruno's name for his plan, "crisscross," from the tennis rackets, also identifies an intricate game of role playing. Robert Walker had been typecast in wholesome and comfortably straight parts, and there is no indication that he was anything other than comfortably straight in real life. If he resented playing a gay character, as Ruth Roman averred (Granger 71), this is not evident in his performance. To the contrary, he is entirely at ease in a complex role requiring him to flirt, pout, charm, and torment, sometimes all at once. The uncomfortable one is Farley Granger, though not for the reason one would expect. A sexually active gay himself (this had been known to Hitch-

cock since *Rope*),[5] Granger is obliged not only to play a superstraight but also to reject the advances of a straight who is playing a gay in favor of kissing and other pretend intimacies with an actress who may or may not know. In view of this information, Hitchcock's inscription of a line from Kipling—"And treat those two imposters just the same"—above a portal at Forest Hills during Guy's tournament match takes on new relevance.[6]

In an age of "outing," Hitchcock's elaborate masquerade may appear a lamentable embrace of the values of the closet. For 1951, during the era of classical Hollywood, when the representation of homosexuality was strictly circumscribed, the film was sweepingly transgressive. Hollywood's way was to ban homosexual subjects outright and even forbid acknowledgment of their existence. A homoerotic component could never be admitted to, even when painfully obvious, as in single-sex films involving men in action or women in show business. Gayness could only be suggested in contexts of ridicule or excess, as with character actor Franklin Pangborn's "sissified" dandies (Russo) or Agnes Moorehead's hard-edged spinsters (P. White) or Humphrey Bogart's outrageous caricature in *The Big Sleep*—swishy movement, fluttery hands, pursed mouth, lispy voice, fastidious manner, and cattiness. Hitchcock threw it all over by situating male bonding in ambiguous contexts sometimes associated with gay cruising, casting a well-known actor in a complex and sympathetic role involving a high degree of gay legibility, and getting the film into commercial release by a major studio. As for the Senate hearings, the suggestion that they forced Hitchcock into submission seems to me indefensible; if anything, he was quietly defiant.

[III]

In a famous short piece on Greta Garbo, Barthes gushes with the intensity one associates with the starstruck. Garbo's face, he writes, is "an archetype," "a Platonic Idea," "essential beauty [. . .] descended from a heaven where all things are formed and perfected in the clearest light" (*Mythologies* 56–57). It is hard to believe that anyone ever took such stuff seriously. The face of Garbo was collaboratively authored by the actress and William H. Daniels, cinematographer on all but four of her twenty-four United States films. The plastic material was a classic Scandinavian face—heart-shaped, with a distinct hairline, high cheekbones, and sculpturally balanced features, particularly the eyes. Like other cinematographers who worked with leading MGM actresses, Daniels was accorded unusual latitude. Faces register both the internal and the external selves. Daniels insisted that sets on Garbo pictures be closed because she was painfully shy, and he avoided full-figure shots where possible and preferred reclining shots over standing ones because of her ungainly height. The smoothness of her skin enabled him to shoot her with the optical clarity of wide-angle lenses; a counterbalancing softness is achieved through illumination effects, such as sidelighting one part of her profile in halftone and leaving the rest in shadow or in-scene placement of tiny light sources that seem to flicker or glow. He insisted that the camera "peer" into her eyes, the source of her mystery, and he highlighted them by throwing light from above so that her long natural eyelashes cast gentle shadows on her cheeks (Bedford; Higham). The singularity of Garbo's onscreen face is largely attributable to the singularity of the effects used to produce it. If Barthes had understood film practice, the terms of his theorization of images, and possibly even the terms of antiauthorial discourse in general, might have been very different.

Collaboration analysis has two phases. The first entails the temporary suspension of single-author primacy—or, as in the case of Garbo, of textual authority—to appraise constituent claims to a text's authorship. In the second phase, the primary author is reinscribed within what is now established as an institutional context of authorship. The result is a more judicious understanding of authorial achievement that ultimately enhances,

not diminishes, the primary author. This outcome differs from that of multiple-authorship studies, which characteristically (in spite of themselves) devalue text and authors because of the sharing of agency, and from that of collective-authorship studies, which tend to regard the dispersal of agency as the given to be contemplated. The collaboration model might have implications outside film interpretation. In performance studies, for instance: I suspect that its subordinate status in the modern literary enterprise is largely owing to a fear that alternative models of authorship might compromise authorial sacrality in the canon; Shakespearean performance is a prime example. Or another: new-media theorizing has made much of concurrent and serial authorship but has yet to produce a coherent authorial aesthetic; perhaps an old-media model can be to the point, even if it lacks cybercachet.

Notes

[1] For example, it is not represented in standard anthologies of authorship such as Burke (*Authorship*) and Caughie. It is sometimes not even recognized in film, as in Grant, the most recent overview of film authorship studies.

[2] The report uses the term *homosexual* for men and women but is chiefly concerned with men. In this essay I use *gayness* to refer to men and women and *gay* to refer to men.

[3] Carringer and Schatz are studies of collaborative authorship.

[4] I am grateful to Patrick McGilligan, author of a forthcoming book on Hitchcock, for sharing this bit of information and other details of the roles of Ormonde, Whitfield Cook, and Barbara Keon in the evolution of the film's script.

[5] Laurents, Granger's longtime lover, recently disclosed these details (122–36).

[6] Possibly the inscription on the lighter takes on new meaning, too—Alfred adds an *A* to *Guy*, making him *gAy*. Hitchcock was uncommonly partial to wordplay with first names, including his own.

Works Cited

Aitken, Will. "Love Match." *Christopher Street* Sept. 1980: 58–61.

Baecque, Antoine de, and Serge Toubiana. *Truffaut*. Trans. Catherine Temerson. New York: Knopf, 1999.

Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. 1957. Selected and trans. Annette Lavers. New York: Hill, 1972.

———. *S/Z*. 1970. Trans. Richard Miller. New York: Hill, 1974.

———. *Writing Degree Zero*. 1953. Trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. New York: Hill, 1968.

Bedford, Pat. "William Daniels, ASC: 'An Inventor of Detail.'" *American Cinematographer* Mar. 1983: 44–48.

Burke, Seán, ed. *Authorship: From Plato to the Postmodern: A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1995.

———. *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1998.

Carringer, Robert. *The Making of* Citizen Kane. Rev. ed. Berkeley: U of California P, 1996.

Caughie, John, ed. *Theories of Authorship: A Reader*. London: Routledge, 1981.

Chandler, Raymond. *The Long Goodbye*. Boston: Houghton, 1953.

Conarroe, Joel. Editor's Column. *PMLA* 95 (1980): 3–4.

Corber, Robert J. "Hitchcock's Washington: Spectatorship, Ideology, and the 'Homosexual Menace' in *Strangers on a Train*." *Hitchcock's America*. Ed. Jonathan Freedman and Richard Millington. New York: Oxford UP, 1999. 99–121. Rev. rpt. of "Reconstructing Homosexuality: Hitchcock and the Homoerotics of Spectatorial Pleasure." *In the Name of National Security: Hitchcock, Homophobia, and the Political Construction of Gender in Postwar America*. Durham: Duke UP, 1993.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. 1967. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1976.

Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. 1961. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Vintage, 1988.

———. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. 1966. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1994.

Granger, Farley. "Granger on a Train." With Jessie Lilley. *Scarlet Street* 21 (1996): 66+.

Grant, Catherine. "www.auteur.com?" *Screen* 41 (2000): 101–09.

Higham, Charles. Interview with William Daniels. *Hollywood Cameramen: Sources of Light*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1970. 57–74.

Highsmith, Patricia. *Strangers on a Train*. 1950. London: Heinemann, 1966.

Hiney, Tom. *Raymond Chandler: A Biography*. New York: Atlantic Monthly, 1997.

Hitchcock, Alfred, dir. *Strangers on a Train*. 1951. DVD. Warner, 1997.

Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism; or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke UP, 1991.

Laurents, Arthur. *Original Story By: A Memoir of Broadway and Hollywood.* New York: Knopf, 2000.

Legman, G[ershon]. *Love and Death: A Study in Censorship.* New York: Breaking Point, 1949.

MacShane, Frank. *The Life of Raymond Chandler.* New York: Dutton, 1976.

———. *Selected Letters of Raymond Chandler.* New York: Columbia UP, 1981.

Mason, Michael. "Marlowe, Men and Women." *The World of Raymond Chandler.* Ed. Miriam Gross. London: Weidenfeld, 1977. 89–101.

"Perverts Called Government Peril." *New York Times* 19 Apr. 1950: 25.

Russo, Vito. *The Celluloid Closet: Homosexuality in the Movies.* New York: Harper, 1981.

Samuels, Robert. *Hitchcock's Bi-textuality: Lacan, Feminisms, and Queer Theory.* Albany: State U of New York P, 1998.

Schaefer, William D. Editor's Column. *PMLA* 92 (1977): 379–80.

Schatz, Thomas. "Anatomy of a House Director: Capra, Cohn, and Columbia in the 1930s." *Frank Capra: Authorship and the Studio System.* Ed. Robert Sklar and Vito Zagarrio. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1998. 10–36.

"Senators Back Morals Probe." *Los Angeles Times* 25 May 1950: I14.

Truffaut, François. "Une certaine tendance du cinéma français." *Cahiers du cinéma* Jan. 1954: 15–28.

United States. Cong. Senate. Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Depts. *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government.* Interim Rept. 81st. Cong., 2nd sess. Washington: GPO, 1950.

White, Patricia. "Supporting Character: The Queer Career of Agnes Moorehead." *Out in Culture: Gay, Lesbian, and Queer Essays on Popular Culture.* Ed. Corey K. Creekmur and Alexander Doty. Durham: Duke UP, 1995. 91–114.

White, William S. "Inquiry by Senate on Perverts Asked." *New York Times* 20 May 1950: 8.

Wood, Robin. *Hitchcock's Films.* New York: Barnes, 1965.

———. "Responsibilities of a Gay Film Critic." *Film Comment* Jan.-Feb. 1978: 12–17.