Current study of gender and the early Gothic is sophisticated at the expense of examining few texts. This paper examines hundreds of popular Gothic works to ask whether female writers created categorically different works than their male peers. Two qualitative bibliographies of the Gothic provide “motifs” and “Gothic types” for computational modelling. The role of “authoress” may come with unique constraints, but the popular Gothic is not strongly divided by authorial gender.

Over the course of two literary experiments, in which I model the early Gothic novel by means of bibliographic data, I ask whether the hundreds of women writing Gothic novels wrote observably different books than the hundreds of men doing the same. In doing so, I find that male and female schools do indeed exist, but that they do not map neatly to a set of female/male terror/horror Radcliffe/Lewis binaries, and that both gendered schools are dwarfed by a non-gendered Gothic mainstream.

**Computationally Distant-Reading Bibliographical Thin Descriptions In Search Of A Women’s Gothic; Or, I Have Approximate Knowledge of Many Things**

[This paper emphasizes the continuities between new computational approaches to literature and the venerable tradition of archival bibliographical research] [Heather Love turns to sociological microanalysis as a model for 'thin description' close-but-not-deep reading methods … I propose (qualitative computational modelling?) as another method which seeks the same goals] Love emphasizes thin description as not just “fine-grained” but “exhaustive” (and possibly exhausting)[[1]](#footnote-1) but with the reward that “one could—at least ideally—pay equal attention to every aspect … and record it faithfully.”[[2]](#footnote-2) [I add to this that good descriptions offer themselves up for reuse and recombination, by rendering somehow graspable that which they describe] [Downplaying the importance of close interpretation, Love says that “Good descriptions … account for the real variety that is already there.”[[3]](#footnote-3) It is the work of *accounting for* real variety that both bibliography and computation demand: [the systems/models must have a way to cope with odd cases] [To move forward, one must ultimately *decide*] I use computational interventions to interrogate the literary models represented in two older bibliographies. [In so doing, I argue, I demonstrate the utility of qualitative description for the field, a promising avenue toward revisiting older scholarships / maintaining / re-forging connections with the work that has come before] [I also seek to bridge the gap between historical and aesthetic attempts to study the Gothic in the late 18thC]

[By turning to the late eighteenth-century Gothic (particularly the troublesome category of “the female Gothic”), I examine a mass of books that nobody wanted to get stuck reading even when they were first published][(cite Garside on publishers’ exasperation)] [nowadays “Almost all of these novels have long since been deservedly forgotten.” (CITE review of Garside)] [More generalist works, too, like The Oxford Handbook, generally a historicist / bibliographical work, take an aesthetic subgenre of the “female Gothic” for granted.] [David Richter defines both male and female camps: “The ‘female Gothic’ is … a melodrama arousing sympathy and suspense through the unwarranted persecution of an innocent. The ‘male Gothic’ is a punitive tragedy…in which we are made both to desire and to expect the condign punishment of the central figure.” (CITE The Gothic Novel and the Lingering Appeal of Romance p 479)] [Even Barbara Benedict’s “‘Male’ and ‘Female’ Novels?” says “the subgenre of the female Gothic, which emphasized the uncertainties of perception that heroines suffer in an obscure, dangerous, patriarchal world” (CITE p 364)] [but they are much less uniform so I will seek to attend to their real variety]

Scholarly inquiry into the impact of gender on the emergence of the Gothic novel in the late eighteenth century has grown increasingly nuanced. At its inception and for most of its literary history, criticism of Gothic emotional excess or implausible machinery generally went hand-in-hand with dismissals of the genre as unserious due to its perceived alignment with women. In the 1980s, feminist critics like Juliann Fleenor enabled the “Female Gothic”, defined as Gothic works “written and consistently read by women”[[4]](#footnote-4), to stand as a worthy object of study regardless of the individual works’ literary qualities due to their direct relationships to a patriarchal paradigm and their ability “to express the conflict for which patriarchy has no name”.[[5]](#footnote-5) Contemporary critics have turned their attention from relationships between women and their world to relationships between texts.[[6]](#footnote-6) This shift is exemplified in Robert Miles’s sophisticated reading of Ann Radcliffe and Matthew Lewis’s works as making use of both “Female Gothic” and “Male Gothic” “narrative grammar”.[[7]](#footnote-7) My interest is in something less fine-grained: not the exemplary literary aesthetic of the Female Gothic, but the popular phenomenon of a *women’s* Gothic.

Having declared an interest in bibliographies and the turn of the nineteenth century, Peter Garside and James Raven’s monumental *The English Novel, 1770–1829* immediately demands consideration. Lee Erickson aptly called it “magnificent” for its scope.[[8]](#footnote-8) [But Garside isn’t so interested in the qualitative.] [A meticulous and comprehensive compendium of precise physical details can’t feed my desire for the idiosyncratic / the aesthetic] [He emphasizes “the full title given to the work, the imprint of the original publisher(s), and unmediated information as to how authorship was first signified”] [He’s interested in “the ways in which novels were first projected at their readers”[[9]](#footnote-9), and so The notes include information about dedicatees, issue variations, subscription lists, included advertisements, subsequent editions, translations, and attributions] [The key editorial intervention is the inclusion of contemporary reviews] [Instead of Garside, I am using Ann Tracy and Frederick Frank.] [Both of these bibliographies are old and their basic title, publisher, etc, info is surely duplicated in Garside] [But both also offer substantial qualitative descriptions of the works they list, including summaries of their contents.] Ann Tracy indexes 208 works from the years 1753-1857, of which 103 are by female authors, 95 by male, and only 10 unknown. Frederick Frank indexes 499 works published in the years 1753 to 1835 (with one outlier by Beckford not published until 1912). 215 of Frank’s authors are female, 156 male, and 128 unknown. Because each bibliographer excludes some works which are included by the other, only 178 works are indexed in both texts. [Together they include information about X unique texts.] Both show substantially higher counts of female authorship, and lower counts of anonymous authorship, than [were typical of novels as a whole (cite Oxford Handbook)] [This might be selection bias or it might reflect more underlying reality than expected to the period’s assumption that women wrote Gothics; this paper won’t answer that question, but will instead statistically normalize raw book counts] [Transition sentence; reiterate the question I am trying to answer - did men and women write differently?]

[Although I will use a number of graphs to make my argument, I’m not doing “data visualization”, I’m modelling.] Johanna Drucker has given compelling warnings about the dangers of treating constructed information as empirically objective “data” which may then be passively “visualized”.[[10]](#footnote-10) Willard McCarty’s discussion of models as both “pragmatic” and “fictive” is more accurate to the scholarly process of gathering, classifying, correlating, and interpreting information.[[11]](#footnote-11) Whether a model is a reading or a bar chart, the worth of that model must be judged by its “fruitfulness”[[12]](#footnote-12), a term for which Stephen Ramsay provides a useful definition: “the robustness of the discussion that a particular procedure annunciates”[[13]](#footnote-13). In other words, whether or not the model has revealed what we expected to see, it has revealed something with which we must now engage. Exact correspondence is thus less of a “fundamental principle”[[14]](#footnote-14), and more of an imagined destination which spurs valuable journeys. This allows us to cope with the fact that as a model is constructed, it becomes sensitive to some areas of difference while eliding others. No model needs to be accurate in all points, so long as it is sensitive to the desired area of differences. [Not all models are computational] the meticulous historical research of Leah Price, whose monograph *The Anthology and the Rise of the Novel* argues that any edited text — ‘elaborate’ or not — produces, not a flawed or distorted copy of the original, but a new text.[[15]](#footnote-15) As Price observes, when scholars examine texts — when we take notes on them, extract quotes for close reading, summarize of categorize scenes, chapters of books — our act of reading is also one of editing. McCarty allows us to recognize that this mental editing is not a sign of scholarly weakness, but a model, made necessary by the limits of human memory. [This is the source of my claim for continuity between what I do and what bibliographies do]

My two ‘texts’ — bibliographies by Ann Tracy and Frederick Frank — are thus themselves models of “The Gothic Novel.” Because, as Price observes, the process of editing a text must always reveal the editor’s “unspoken assumptions about the most efficient way to convey information, and indeed what counts as information at all,”[[16]](#footnote-16) the editorial processes behind each bibliography makes each one sensitive to very different concerns. Ann Tracy’s *The Gothic Novel 1790-1830: Plot Summaries and Index to Motifs* emphasizes dramatic events and singular images, with recurring details systematically tallied in the index. In contrast, Frederick Frank’s *The First Gothics: A Critical Guide to the English Gothic Novel* emphasizes each work’s overall tone and provides qualitative and subtle evaluations of its critical reception. Although only 178 works are shares between the two, they usefully complement each other in the search for gendered Gothic writing traditions. The procedure of computationally re-rendering each bibliography amplifies each bibliographer’s choices, allowing me to see whether their distinctions are fruitful, and whether their models point toward distinct men’s and women’s Gothics.

Over the course of two literary experiments, in which I model the early Gothic novel by means of bibliographic data, I ask whether the hundreds of women writing Gothic novels wrote observably different books than the hundreds of men doing the same. In doing so, I find that male and female schools do indeed exist, but that they do not map neatly to a set of female/male terror/horror Radcliffe/Lewis binaries, and that both gendered schools are dwarfed by a non-gendered Gothic mainstream.

Tracy’s bibliography is built to be more like a particularly helpful finding aid than a comprehensive check-list. Her most unusual qualitative bibliographical work is her ten-page “Index to Motifs” identifying the books in which 208 different “motifs” appear. Tracy uses the term “motif” broadly to encompass a wide range of plot elements, images, and character types. The index is intended for “scholars with particular interests”[[17]](#footnote-17), who wish to locate and read books containing individual story elements, such as “doppelganger” or “garden as scene of temptation”. Accordingly, Tracy prioritizes presenting a wide range of highly distinctive motifs rather than those that constitute the norm. Indeed, she intentionally excluded the most popular motifs: “the abundance of murders,” she says, “argued for the retention… of specialized murders only,”[[18]](#footnote-18) and castles have similarly been ignored. In addition to the motifs, Tracy provides a plot summary of each novel. Her summaries, too, emphasize distinctive details, pointing out things like “a particularly interesting Satan, with molten insides”.[[19]](#footnote-19) As a model of the Gothic, Tracy’s bibliography elides continuities to increase its sensitivity to points of difference. It treats each novel as a collection of discrete elements, only one of which is likely to be of interest to a given scholar. The motifs themselves — Satans, murders, doppelgangers, gardens — are thus constructed as the stable objects of study, which must be examined through the filter of individual novels.

I take Tracy’s model to its logical extension by foregrounding her motifs. I distilled her index of 208 motifs into 92 charts of motifs which appear in at least 20 works.[[20]](#footnote-20) Using her model to investigate the possibility of a women’s Gothic, I examine the potential predictive power of each motif. I ask whether the presence of any given motif in a work constitutes meaningful information regarding the probable gender of that work’s author. A series of procedural design choices emphasizes the qualitative interpretation inherent in my framing of this question.[[21]](#footnote-21) An identifiable gendered school immediately emerges: 38 distinctly male-authored motifs[[22]](#footnote-22) indicate a men’s Gothic defined by largely the things we would expect men to dominate.

Reading the motifs in order from most female-dominated to most male-dominated involves a constant escalation. Women may write about libertines (64% female), whose seductions may be coercive and almost always end poorly for their victims, but men write about the act of rape itself (75% male). Tracy’s motifs suggest that the darkest side of the Gothic was primarily the province of men: death is female-dominated when it is sad or pious (61% female), but murder is male-dominated (64% male), as are blood (68% male), corpses (70% male), and skeletons and skulls (73% male). When male authors write about death, then, it seems that they dwell not on its emotional impact, but on its more vivid physical results. Similarly, human sacrifice (64% male), starvation (67% male), torture (67% male), and putrefaction (74% male), all involve directly depicting that which other novels might merely imply. The masculine impulse to “go farther,” to replace coy allusions with unflinching enactments, is most evident in these novels’ treatment of incest. General themes of incest are widespread, appearing in 51 of the 208 novels under consideration — nearly a quarter of the works. However, in 45 of those novels, there are no cases of what Tracy terms “actual” incest, only “incest, literary flirtation with (including false alarms, foiled attempts, threats, and unconsummated incestuous passion).” The narrative discretion behind a literary flirtation with incest is employed roughly equally by both male and female authors (54% male / 46% female), and makes up the vast majority of all depictions of incest. However, six cases of actual, no-narrative-flinching incest are documented— and all six are by men. To force one’s readers to look directly at the horrors depicted, rather than allowing them to become terrified by their own imaginations, is, of course, the technique of the horror Gothic, as contrasted with the terror Gothic. Identifying the horror Gothic as a predominantly male affair comes as no surprise, and accords nicely with the critical tradition of identifying Matthew Lewis as the quintessential horror Gothic writer. Together, these motifs point to a distinct men’s Gothic in the Lewisian horror tradition.

In contrast to this abundance of male-dominated tropes, female-authored tropes are elusive. The Radcliffean plot elements of subterranean passages (61% male), caves (61% male), and secret doors (59% male) turn out to be firmly correlated with male authors, not female. This is not to say that these motifs are not Radcliffean: Radcliffe alone accounts for 7% of all caves, 11% of all secret doors, and an astonishing 15% of all subterranean passages. Indeed, she is the top author for both subterranean passages and secret doors. But beyond Radcliffe, these tropes have been disproportionately adopted by men, not women. The critical emphasis on subterranean passages and caves as crucial Gothic tropes can likely be explained by who makes the “top 10” lists of their use:

Subterranean Passages

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Radcliffe, Ann** | 6 |
| **Ireland, William Henry** | 3 |
| **Curties, T. J. Horsley** | 3 |
| **unsigned** | 2 |
| **Sleath, Eleanor** | 2 |
| **Maturin, Charles Robert** | 2 |
| **Lewis, Matthew** | 2 |
| **Yorke, Mrs. R. M. P.** | 1 |
| **Wilkinson, Sarah** | 1 |
| **Walpole, Horace** | 1 |

Caves

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Lewis, Matthew** | 4 |
| **Roche, Regina Maria** | 3 |
| **Radcliffe, Ann** | 3 |
| **unsigned** | 2 |
| **Maturin, Charles Robert** | 2 |
| **Ireland, William Henry** | 2 |
| **Green, William Child** | 2 |
| **Curties, T. J. Horsley** | 2 |
| **Wilkinson, Sarah** | 1 |
| **Walpole, Horace** | 1 |

Although neither motif appears widely throughout the Gothic, they repeat within the works of all four authors typically taken as the landmark writers of the genre: Walpole for the Gothic’s birth, Radcliffe and Lewis for its flourishing, and Maturin for its end. Anything prominently used by all four is surely ripe for closely-read comparison. But those comparisons illuminate more about the individual authors than the Gothic’s general usage; and, in the case of subterranean passages, they tell us more about Radcliffe than they do a women’s Gothic.

Instead, in this model of the genre, the women’s Gothic seems to be defined by only four things: libertines (64% female), forced weddings (62% female), sad or pious deaths (61% female), and miniature portraits (61% female). The libertines and miniature portraits in particular, as the most common female motifs, immediately suggest a women’s Gothic that is in striking conversation with novels like Jane Austen’s, whose ordered and rational novels are nonetheless replete with rakes and miniatures. Or, looking at their prominence in the top ten for each of these tropes, one might be tempted to investigate Regina Maria Roche and Louisa Sidney Stanhope as the unexpected representatives of the women’s Gothic. However, the paucity of female motifs suggests that defining a genre here may be too hasty. The male motifs represented a variety of elements used by many different men, such that no one author could be responsible for the pattern being identified with his author. These female motifs are far less robust: if we ignore either Roche or Stanhope, we are down to just two female-dominated motifs, and if we ignore both, we are left with zero. When it comes to the inclusion of particular story elements, then, this women’s Gothic is outnumbered not just by the men’s Gothic but also by the mainstream Gothic.

More than half of the motifs under consideration are not strongly gendered in either direction. Four — elopement (all subcategories); dueling and other single combat; fainting, female; and rediscovery of lost relatives — are even perfect ties. Moreover, the more popular a motif is — that is, the larger a role it plays in constituting the default expectations of the genre — the more likely it is to be non-gendered. Indeed, all of the strongly male-dominated motifs are much less common than the more neutral motifs. The neutrality of the most popular motifs is essentially a mathematical inevitability: nothing can achieve more than 50% popularity while being used by only 50% of authors. The Gothic mainstream must be defined by that which is available to all authors within the genre. In terms of sheer prevalence, the defining features of the Gothic appear to be fainting (present in 77% of all novels), confinement (66% of novels), abduction (57%), references to suicide (47%), and storms (44%). Only one of those five motifs, suicide (61% male), shows hints of a gendered divide.

This motif-based model of the early Gothic suggests that, rather than a balanced oppositions of Radcliffe’s female terror Gothic versus Lewis’s male horror Gothic, the genre as a popular movement was defined by a less-sensationalist (possibly Radcliffean, possibly terror-mode) non-gendered Gothic mainstream, with a subset of male horror Gothic writers making up a minor tradition within it. These results serve as a useful reminder that not all contrasts are perfect binaries; the existence of a men’s Gothic tradition does not require that everything outside that tradition be a perfectly-opposed women’s Gothic.

Having explored one bibliographic model in depth, we now have a point of comparison for our next model of men and women’s Gothics. Although it attempts to model the same field, Frederick Frank’s bibliography encourages a very different understanding of the texts he indexes. Unlike Tracy, Frank is interested in not just what happens, but in *how* it happens. His “Critical Synopsis” of each text functions entirely differently from Tracy’s “Plot Summary,” often providing very few plot details in favor of describing the work’s literary borrowings, narrative structure, and historical reception.[[23]](#footnote-23) Unlike Tracy, he includes an assessment of each work’s “Gothic type,” but these “types” are not stable overarching categories: for his 500 texts, Frank provides 309 unique classifications.[[24]](#footnote-24) In their flexibility and detail, Frank’s “types” reflect Frow’s understanding of genre: it is impossible to classify each text into the genre to which it “belongs”; instead, Frank describes the generic expectations which each text uses. His Gothic type for Sophia Lee’s *The Recess*, for example, labels the novel as “Gothified history (terror and sentimental elements), connecting it simultaneously to the “Gothified history” of William Godwin’s *St. Leon*, the “terror mode” of Radcliffe’s novels, and the “sentimental Gothic” of Charlotte Dacre’s *The Libertine* and *The Passions*. These threads cannot be traced systematically — he provides no index or definition of the types themselves. They are hardly even deterministic: The Mysteries of Ferney Castle is listed twice, once under each of its disputed authors, and receives a different Gothic type in each entry (“Pure or high Gothic (terror mode)” at entry 188 by Robert Huish, and “Gothified history (Radcliffean imitation)” at entry 222 by G. Lambe). Instead, his Gothic types model the Gothic as a shifting history, with each novel as the temporary centre of influences that stretch both forward and backward in time.

Adapting Frank’s model for my own, then, required working somewhat against the grain of his assumptions. However, I have avoided simply assigning each text one simple genre. Instead, I have separated out each strand of influence within his complex “Gothic types” by dividing each “type” into a set of tags, and tallied the uses of each tag.[[25]](#footnote-25) This process generated 190 unique tags, most of which only applied to one or two works. By rendering the tags individually listable, my model imposes a more systematic ontology than Frank’s. However, because each work is “tagged” numerous times, my model retains the details of each work’s often-idiosyncratic combinations of influences. My approach treats each “tag” as an independent object of inquiry, informative on its own regarding one small facet of a work’s participation in its generic context. I ask whether the association of a given tag with a work constitutes meaningful information regarding the probable gender of that work’s author. Because Frank’s classifications are subjective assessments, an answer of “yes” to this question could have two meanings. When we find, for example, that the “sentimental” tag predicts female authorship, this could indicate either that women really did write more sentimental novels, or that certain common features of the Gothic are more likely to be *called* sentimental when women write them. Correlating genre tags with less ambiguous features of the work — such as the inclusion of particular motifs — will, later, allow us to examine to what extent Frank is responding to differences in authorial usage. But regardless of their basis, Frank’s assessments are informative about the horizon of critical expectations. Frank’s model of the multiplicity of Gothic subgenres, in the reverse of Tracy, shows an identifiable women’s Gothic, whereas the men’s Gothic is elusive.

Frank’s women’s Gothic challenges few stereotypes of women’s writing. Unlike Tracy, he indexes far more women than men (X men and Y women, compared to her X men and Y women), in keeping with the idea of a female-authored deluge of writing. [Transition,] three of the most popular tags are even more female-dominated than his woman-heavy sample would lead us to expect: 43% of Frank’s corpus is written by women, but that 43% is responsible for 50% of the “terror” works, 65% of the “Radcliffean” works, and a striking 77% of the “sentimental.” Contemporary criticism has worked to revise the eighteenth-century consensus that the literary sphere was overtaken with a flood of dangerous sentimental literature by and for women: Barbara Benedict, for example, ruthlessly debunks a range of “manifestly untrue” eighteenth-century perceptions of reading demographics,[[26]](#footnote-26) and many others have agreed that most readers and most writers were men, and even that men and women mostly read the same things. However, the preponderance of women writing Frank’s sentimental works suggests a kernel of truth underlying eighteenth-century critics’ panic. It is entirely possible for readers to be mostly male, and authors mostly male, even within the sphere of specifically Gothic publishing, but for female authors to nonetheless write [a distinct woman-only kind of book.] Frank presents us with a Radcliffean, sentimental, terror Gothic which is also a women’s Gothic. This women’s Gothic is exactly the sort of thread which would be invisible in Tracy’s model, because it doesn’t operate by identifiable motif. If we turn away from privileged subject matter which only women will think to describe — not subterranean passages or blood — and instead observe the less-quantifiable intangibles that Frank uses — [tone/set of aesthetic decisions/attitude/set of tropes] — then we can find a women’s Gothic.

A men’s Gothic is more elusive in Frank’s model. Like in Tracy, the men’s tags generally apply only to very few novels, reflecting a minor tradition. Unlike in Tracy, there are very few of these minor men’s tags. The ones that do exist reinforce the conclusions we drew more strongly based on Tracy’s model. Men outnumber women in the “Germanic” tag (which encompasses “German”, “Germanic”, “Schauerroman”, “Rauberroman”, and “Ritterroman”) — of these 29 Germanic Gothics, 18 are by men (62%). “Horror”, too, is disproportionately male: 42% of “horror” works are by men, a proportion that is solidly above their baseline 31%, though not astonishing. “Lewisite” is about the same (46% male). More strikingly male-dominated are two characteristics which would be invisible in Tracy’s motif-focused view: “polemical” and “prototypical” works. 12 works are identified as “proto” or “early” forms of something else; of those 12, 7 are by men (58%).[[27]](#footnote-27) A slightly larger group of works exists with the tags “polemical,” “philosophical,” “political,” and “radical/revolutionary” — of these 19, 13 are by men (68%). The highest male percentage that applies to more than one work is for “polemical” Gothics, which fiercely flog some viewpoint or another: 83% of the six “polemical” works are by men. The masculine assessment of “polemical” works is particularly suggestive in light of the numbers for “didactic” works, which are entirely neutral (50% each). “Didactic” works are the only works with a persuasive agenda in which men do not dominate, suggesting a qualitative distinction: men can produce confrontational political works, whereas the didactic is a more equal-opportunity field in which women, too, can promote their ideas under the aegis of instruction. Whether the gendered distinction comes from the eighteenth century or the twenty-first, Frank’s model has added an additional dimension to the conclusion we drew from Tracy, that male authors can choose their subject matter more freely.

Frank’s Gothic mainstream is largely non-gendered. The two most prevalent tags in the corpus as a whole, representing all Gothic without attention paid to authorial gender, are “Gothic” (83% of all works) and “pure/high” (39%), both of which have the same gendered distribution of the sample as a whole. Our only hint of a gendered trend is the third most prevalent tag, “terror” (34% of works), which, at 50% female, is just above the female baseline. [This is not exciting.] The next two tags in prominence are not informative about genre variation, but instead highlight the multiplicity of Frank’s assessments: the tags “mode” and “elements” are each applied to 27% of all works in the sample. These terms generally appear as qualifiers for his other assessments, as in “terror mode” or “sentimental elements,” and accordingly remind us to modify the implied force of “terror” and “sentimental” as tags. Indeed, many of Frank’s tags are essentially qualifiers: “mode”, “effects”, “Gothified”, and “imitation,” for example. In Frank’s Gothic typology, then, the Gothic is not monolithic: [works use elements of things, but things mostly come from other places/ are interconnected] Nothing for Frank is just one genre. Horror and terror, for example, are far from mutually exclusive. Of the 53 “horror” works, 26 (49%) are also tagged “terror”. These 26 are 50% by men, making the horror-terror mode more predictive of male authorship than horror alone. Of the remaining 27 works which are purely horror, no terror, there are 9 by women, 9 by men, and 9 unknown — a far cry from the horror Gothic as the exclusive province of men. This is the reverse of Tracy — Tracy showed a male horror and equal-opportunity terror mainstream; Frank shows equal-opportunity horror, and female terror. Between the two, the only part that’s consistent is that terror vastly outnumbers horror. There are gendered currents, but none of them are striking enough to start making predictions about the many unsigned works.

Attempting to compare the two models raises the prospect of combining them. It’s been a open question to this point whether Frank’s Gothic types were responding to actually gendered usage or imposing gendered interpretations. When it comes to assessing a work as “polemical” versus “didactic”, for example, the tone difference is a subjective interpretation which could easily be influenced by his knowledge of the author’s gender. [But Tracy’s boolean motifs — although they may be prone to false negatives, and are certainly lacking/vague in interpretive detail — are at least safe from false positives] [We can thus evaluate the potentially-gendered basis of Frank’s type assessments by considering the motifs associated with each tag] [Because, as we saw earlier, Tracy’s motifs only render certain kinds of literary features visible, we are now doubly prone to false negatives] [But we can still hope for some true positives] [SO:] Does knowing Frank gave a work a certain tag tell us anything about what motifs it probably has? [For both “terror” and “horror”, we can examine the motifs which distinguish it from the baseline mainstream Gothic, and which motifs distinguish it from the other tag.]

[There are some horror motifs, and they seem reasonable] At the top of the list is “Inquisition” — 63% of “horror” Gothics include the Inquisition, an enormous increase over the baseline 15% presence of that motif. [This striking result lends credence to the work of scholars like Robert Miles who take conspiracy as a central horror-Gothic concern.] [Next, less expectedly, are secret doors, at the exact same level of increase — 48% more secret doors in “horror” novels than in the corpus as a whole.] “Horror” Gothics also have 47% more prophetic dreams, 46% more corpses, 40% more drugging, and 39% more banishment than the corpus as a whole. These motifs remain distinctly associated with “horror” when we narrow our focus to compare that tag to “terror” instead of the corpus as a whole: they all occur two to three times more often with the “horror” tag than with “terror”. Horror and terror are most sharply distinguished, though, by “actual incest”, which occurs five times more often with “horror” than with “terror”. [As in Tracy, this minor motif has strong predictive power.] [Interestingly, however, this represents 3 “horror” tagged works and 2 “terror” tagged works — possibly the “terror” ones are “horror-terror”? [This math is weird, but, basically, 3% of all works contain actual incest; 3% of terror works contain actual incest; 16% of horror works contain actual incest — so the percentage of horror containing the thing is higher / the predictive power of the motif is higher] We know from Tracy that they are certainly all by male authors.] The next strongest distinguishing motifs are “Satan and lesser demons” and “loose woman”, both of which appear four times more frequently in “horror” than in “terror”. Three times more frequent in “horror” works are “rape”, “pre-nuptial death”, and “banishment.” [All of these motifs paint a distinct horror tradition, which our earlier models also allow us to see as male.] [But it complicates our understanding of “horror” by introducing motifs which previously were not male-dominated enough to get mentally put in that bucket.]

The “terror” tag, as expected, is less strongly defined by its motifs. Several motifs do appear with slightly higher frequency within “terror” works than in the baseline, but generally only by a few percentage points — none of them represent even a 20% increase over the baseline. [This is in sharp contrast to the 43 motifs which appear in “horror” works with a 20% or greater increase in frequency.] If we examine the top of the “terror” list anyway, the tag shows an anemic increase in fainting (19% more than baseline), suicide mentions (18%), female fainting (18%), and secret doors (18%), but all of these appear more in “horror” works than they do in “terror.” Fainting, suicide, and secret doors might allow us to distinguish terror and horror Gothics from [sentimental?], but they [are not useful in defining a terror/horror divide / distinguishing terror and horror from each other].] [To seek out that distinction, we can again compare the two tags to each other instead of just comparing terror to the baseline.] [From this view too], however, there are fewer motifs, with weaker correlations: whereas there were three motifs which appeared four or five times more often in horror works than terror works, there are no motifs which distinguish terror that strongly. One motif does appear with triple frequency in terror works compared to horror: “speech, unfinished, on deathbed.” Appearing a little more than twice as often are “good abbess”, and “good clergyman,” and a little less than twice are “attempted or contemplated suicide” and “lunacy.” None of these motifs drew our attention when we examined Tracy alone, because they are not strongly gendered. [It is interesting to see them distinguished now, and consider them as potential markers of a terror Gothic as distinct from a women’s Gothic.] [But they simply reaffirm that terror is mainstream / isn’t gendered]

[This correlation, essentially, confirms that our rough guess was right re: Tracy’s motifs, that the men’s Gothic might operate via striking images but the women’s Gothic less so.] [It also suggests that, when we are seduced by the scenery of the Gothic, we end up paying attention to only a minor thread within it (men’s horror) at the expense of non-motif-ifiable features which better define the mainstream.] [Frank’s more subjective model [takes more work to render graspable / provides fewer things to count that feel obviously countable] but it ultimately reveals the women’s Gothic in the sentimental.]

[Many scholars have been directing new attention toward the sentimental, none of which I knew anything about at the time of these experiments; I was surprised and confused by my findings, and thus offer them, paltry as they are, as an invigorating independent confirmation of e.g. Alex Wetmore]

The picture which Frank’s model paints, of a women’s Gothic equally as tied to the sentimental novel as to the high Gothic, [points toward a new understanding of the Gothic’s genealogy generally.] [This new sentimental genealogy makes some things about the Gothic more clear.] [A full acknowledgement of the Gothic’s sentimental ties can explain, for example, the comparison of *Udolpho* to Elizabeth Inchbald’s *A Simple Story* which so puzzles Clara McIntyre in *Ann Radcliffe in Relation To Her Time*.] In response to a review which declared Udolpho to be “the best composition of this kind since Mrs. Inchbald’s Simple Story,” McIntyre is taken aback by the expression “of this kind”.[[28]](#footnote-28) She says, “The reviewer must surely be thinking of fiction in general, for, except that they are both fiction, two compositions could hardly be more unlike than *The Mysteries of Udolpho* and *A Simple Story*.”[[29]](#footnote-29) McIntyre draws a tentative connection based on “the ethical purpose of the book,” which in Inchbald is “rather too obvious for successful art,” but decides that although Radcliffe’s writing, “it is true, was strictly moral,” Radcliffe’s “main interest” does not lie in moralizing.[[30]](#footnote-30) McIntyre has thus identified what I argue is the key connection between the two works, but overlooks its significance: moral sentiment, and its connection to the emotional experience of the reader, is the throughline which connects the Gothic deeply to its non-Gothic literary context, and to the broader intellectual debates at the end of the Enlightenment.

I thus [return to / find evidence supporting] an older school of criticism, which saw French sentimental novels — rather than German horror stories — as the forbears of the Gothic. [Rousseau actually calls Héloïse “Gothic”!] Ernest Baker, for example, tells this kind of history in his 1929 work *The History of the English Novel: Volume V, The Novel of Sentiment and the Gothic Romance*:

The sources of Gothic romance… are to be sought in the popular variant of the fiction of sensibility evolved by the Abbé Prévost and elaborated later on by Baculard d’Arnaud. The exciting adventures, the violent emotions, the gloomy scenes, forests, and antres, castles, dungeons, and graveyards, in the abbés novels and the plays and stories of Baculard, were to be the distinctive features of Gothic romance through its course. It was all derivative of the cult of emotion…[[31]](#footnote-31)

In this history of the Gothic, German influences are superficial set-dressing rather than inherent to the genre:

Some novelists sought only to conjure up a witching atmosphere of awe and vague apprehension; others employed the most violent shocks of physical anguish and fear. They all dabbled in the supernatural, either playing upon or playing with feelings of superstition; and, later on, those who had become acquainted with German folk-lore and its ghosts and elves and goblins found their account in satiating the greediest appetites for crime, diabolism, and nameless horrors[.][[32]](#footnote-32)

The Gothic is well-established before the first hints of “German folk-lore”, which only arrives “later on” and only in the works of “those who had become acquainted” with it. Even the supernatural is relevant primarily because it allows authors to manipulate readers’ “feelings of superstition” in service of the central emotional experience of fear. Baker’s historical model is not sensitive to the features of the Gothic which now draw attention — he does not make his distinctions based on politics or aesthetics or gender — instead, he defines the Gothic by its emotional manipulations.

Emotional response is salient as a distinguishing factor for Baker because he, like many of his contemporaries, writes from the teleological assumption that the history of the novel must be the history of the *realist* novel. Baker’s approach to the Gothic is not as obviously mediated through editorial intervention as Tracy’s or Frank’s bibliographies; as we would expect, Baker makes no explicitly deformative moves, but proceeds by discussing his various selected texts in their entirety. Nonetheless, he writes on the basis of a model of the genre’s history and its salient features. The assumptions of his model, however, remain implicit in the moralizing judgments throughout his work. Baker’s excoriation of “that amoral person [Laurence] Sterne” for being a “debauched sentimentalist” who “fondled his sensibility,” “aware of his vice, and voluptuously enjoying all its sweetness,”[[33]](#footnote-33) for example, evaluates *Tristram Shandy* along markedly different lines than would now be considered fruitful. J.M.S. Tompkins, too, dismisses the Gothic on the basis of [teleologically realist] assumptions: with the rise of the Gothic, she says, “the average novelist paid, on the whole, very little attention to the probability, and the novel in consequence slipped farther away from reality, as though a window on to the other world had been changed to a magic lantern.”[[34]](#footnote-34) The “magic lantern” of the Gothic is often discussed in positive terms, but [when Tompkins places “reality” as the central point from which one moves “away,” to “slip” is to make negative progress, and the enchanting lantern is rendered dangerous.] Both Baker and Tompkins model the novel itself as a training-ground for the mind, through which habits of thought are established, and which therefore ought to inculcate the “right” mode of thought. Accordingly, both model the Gothic as a dangerously emotional and disordered mode of thought, notable not for its plots or sets or even which emotions are induced, but defined entirely by the emotionally overpowering nature of the reading experience.

I argue that there is, in fact, something in this model which remains fruitful: its understanding of the Gothic[’s history as continuous, rather than a break]. The teleologically realist model defines the Gothic as [a far point on the] spectrum of sentiment, sensation, and sensibility, all of which, Baker argues, are distinguished from each other only by “intensification,” and not in terms of fundamental type.[[35]](#footnote-35) Tompkins, too, argues for a history of continuity, saying that in the Gothic, “the accepted themes were repeated in a shallower tone and overlaid with all the romantic incidents of disguise, abduction, lost heirs and mistaken identity, which had been for hundreds of years the story-tellers stock in trade.”[[36]](#footnote-36) [The “fantastic” elements[, like the motifs, are very exciting, but don’t actually define the genre]] We can reject their realist teleology without rejecting their sensitivity to emotional response.

Doing so allows us to borrow scholarly writing on the sentimental for application to the Gothic. Alex Wetmore, for example, cogently theorizes the highly-fragmented texts which are equally represented in the Gothic as in the sentimental. His discussion of ‘corporeal defamiliarization’ argues that this literary fragmentation is part of a strategy to “foreground books as intimate things to be felt, whose literary value should be approached along physiological lines,”[[37]](#footnote-37) [which is totally what the Gothic does]. [Example of something cool this tells us about a Gothic novel.]

[We have learned a valuable lesson about models today]. [The framework of modelling makes it possible to go ever farther back in our research past] [Surface reading and computational analysis can look like a break with the past] [But they don’t have to be!] [Continuities in the history of the Gothic; changes of quantity / use, not fundamental kind] [Continuities in the pattern of our research; changes of tools, not fundamental kind]

The focus on the settings, theatrical machinery, etc of the Gothic tries to make the story distant from readers— but it was manifestly NOT distant; it was emotionally immediate, just like sentimental novels and novels of sensibility etc

The emotional wildness doesn’t happen in a safely contained and remote fictive realm of irrationality: it’s not a removed place in which to ‘work out’ rebellion against repression — it is a space in which the reader exists as an embodied and connected participant.

[The threat of sensibility remains active. [Other literature gets safer but Gothic gets extra-dangerous?]]
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