1. Introduction

The Gothic novel in the 1790s comes with its own conventional narrative. Ann Radcliffe, the “Great Enchantress,” enthrals audiences for a decade with literary blockbusters which are gobbled up by women who scribble their own novels in response. The marketplace is glutted with these unskilled copies of Radcliffe, written by authoresses eager for Radcliffe’s fame or her financial security, trying to replicate Radcliffe’s formula. The popularity of this “school of Radcliffe” is both its threat and its power: eighteenth century reviewers try to dismiss this swelling tide of women’s writing, or at least to condemn it, but the Gothic cannot be ignored. This conventional narrative of female Gothic excess hasn’t been taken as fully factual since those eighteenth century reviewers first coined it — the story of the great flood of women’s Gothic writing is more revelatory of eighteenth century anxieties than it is of eighteenth century print practice — but it is nonetheless a cornerstone of conversation about the Gothic. [And, as I will show, familiar misapprehensions are harder to remove from our thinking than we think. [Transition / discussion of aims](scrivcmt://CB5C3009-0CD0-4453-BCAC-A18ACC7DE240).]

#

It is necessary for new knowledge to be built upon the foundations of former knowledge; but equally it is necessary to re-investigate the truth of what is “known.” This project revives two qualitative bibliographies from the 1980s to seek gendered patterns of writing among hundreds of early Gothic texts. I am particularly interested in trends that could have predictive power: rather than speculating about a book’s meaning based on its author’s gender, I set out to ask whether, in fact, there is anything in a book’s content that would allow us to speculate on its author’s gender. Implicit in this approach is a methodological critique: for an aspect of writing to merit discussion in gendered terms, it ought to appear correlated with gender in more than a few texts. Given the social reality of gender, it does not require gender essentialism to hypothesize that men and women might have different horizons of publishability[[1]](#footnote-0). The realities of gender are relevant to the work of feminist scholarship, and to the challenging of patriarchal narratives. But gender essentialism is equally dangerous to these aims. [The middle path I chart takes a sociological[?] approach, at a larger scale than individual texts.]. I treat gender as only one possible factor of influence; indeed, I treat gendered difference itself as the hypothesis to be proven. [[Using bibliographies prevents me from re-inventing the wheel, and also lets me “check” past work to see how, and how much, we can repurpose older work.]] Although this paper will make its argument largely by way of numbers, in the new methodology of the “digital humanities”, the central technological intervention is incredibly simple: nothing more than a few bibliographies, turned to a new angle with a “pivot table.” The primary work of knowledge production took place thirty years ago, when Ann Tracy and Frederick Frank [wrote their qualitative bibliographies]. [My contribution is to X.] In the end, I find that, although Ann Tracy’s bibliography can be re-used, Frederick Frank’s bibliography is shaped inextricably and irretrievably by the sexism of the time. Even though we “already know” that older scholarship is sexist, this experiment shows how difficult it is to build on those foundations / correct them.

1.1. The Female Gothic

[[](scrivcmt://F5633C5D-3EC1-4E1D-B088-4D0C295D3313)[The thing in past literary criticism that I wish to subject to scrutiny is the category of the Female Gothic.]](scrivcmt://F5633C5D-3EC1-4E1D-B088-4D0C295D3313) The “obviously” female-associated phenomenon [of the previously mentioned conventional narrative] led to the critical category of the “Female Gothic” to discuss narratives of women in patriarchal distress. Ellen Ledoux lists off the standard requirements — “a distressed heroine, domestic incarceration, threats of sexual violence, anxiety about monstrous or absent mothers” (2) / “women’s domestic incarceration, sexual violence, economic disenfranchisement and spectral maternity” (2). A definition based on the theme of female persecution enabled work like Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar’s Madwoman in the Attic (1979), Kate Ferguson Ellis’s The Contested Castle (1989), Eugenia DeLamotte’s Perils of the Night (1990), and Helene Meyers’s Femicidal Fears (2001) to examine specifically female experiences of the threats of patriarchy, and to take their literary depictions seriously. As their titles show, these works [pursue [individual kinds of fears/themes/motifs] / use the particularity of [motifs?] to tie texts together.] Concurrently, a definition based on female authorship enables Juliann Fleenor’s The Female Gothic (1983), Diane Long Hoeveler’s Gothic Feminism (1998), Emma Clery’s Women’s Gothic (2000), [Pickering and Chatto published a 5-volume series Varieties of Female Gothic (2002)] and Donna Heiland’s Gothic and Gender (2004) [to turn their attention to gender itself / make claims on the scale of gender.] [Make sure to show that both things are good: TODO: Cite whoever it is who praises whichever text it is for its ambitious chronological breadth enabled by the Female Gothic framework]

#

Work that complicates our image the Female Gothic — like work that challenges the conventional image of Radcliffean imitators — is not new. Almost as soon as the term came into use, scholars have been pushing against its boundaries, grappling with the true diversity of women’s Gothic writing[[2]](#footnote-1). Nonetheless, however, even as Gothic studies grew more complex in other ways, this definition offered something useful in identifying and providing vocabulary for a particular set of texts, so it has been impressively stable. The terms “Female Gothic” and “women’s gothic” are both in currency[[3]](#footnote-2). Ledoux argues persuasively that “the category ‘Female Gothic’ more accurately reflects the ideological goals of second-wave feminist literary criticism than it represents the narratives of early women Gothic writers.”[[4]](#footnote-3) Despite many scholars’ work showing that “women’s early Gothic writing— a great deal of which is only accessible to us because of the recovery work of feminist scholars—is much more aesthetically, politically, thematically, and generically diverse than the Female Gothic categorization suggests,” and despite ongoing critical work to refine the term Female Gothic, she finds that “its usage has limited the ways in which scholars approach women’s Gothic writing.”[[5]](#footnote-4) Ledoux set out to “to explain why the discrepancy between available primary textual material and textual analysis exists and how it came to be,”[[6]](#footnote-5) a task which she accomplishes successfully through a carefully close-read history of nineteenth and twentieth century literary politics. [I explore a “middle zone” between primary material and history-of-criticism (bibliography)] [My goal is to take up the work of correcting these discrepancies.]

#

The continuing use of the Female Gothic framework stands in a striking contrast to the dearth of work on the Male Gothic. Even in a context in which men are assumed to be famously outnumbered, the status of “male” as a cultural default means their works are “unmarked” or assumed to be defined by things other than gender. The Female Gothic is often treated as synonymous with the explained supernatural, or the ‘terror’ mode in the terror/horror distinction, but no terminology is used for the ‘unexplained supernatural,’ and horror works by men are called horror, rather than Male Gothic. The few explicit identifications of a male mode of writing begin with the female and define the male as its lack or opposite. Ellen Ledoux, for example, in the context of attaching the Female Gothic to “the ‘explained supernatural style,’”, adds a definition for the Male Gothic, “in which ghosts, devils and other supernatural phenomena demand a willful suspension of disbelief from the reader.”[[7]](#footnote-6) David Richter provides definitions based on plot structures: “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.”[[8]](#footnote-7) [TODO: Robert Miles’ definition] [TODO: more definitions of the male gothic (or places that fail to define it) — like that really weird Jungian book I found] What none of these definitions of a male Gothic include, however, is a link between the literary techniques and the authors’ gendered experience. [I don’t include this either, but I know I don’t include it; that is the “future work” this article calls for.] [Just as I follow Ledoux, others will need to follow me.]

1.2. Methods

By asking whether [I can actually find a difference] between books written by women and books written by men, [at scale], [I occupy a very particular position re: gender.] First, I shift the terms of the conversation so that it is authors, rather than texts or narrative techniques, which have genders: [not a male or female gothic, but men’s and women’s gothics.] This is more than mere semantics. [I reject the spotting of “female gothic” elements that appear in texts regardless of authorial gender; such things as terror, explained supernatural, Whatever Robert Miles Talks About, etc, all exist, but since they exist in works regardless of authorial gender I reject the attempt to impose a gender on them.] [They may well have been gendered in the minds of 18thC audiences but we can try to leave those biases behind.] By continuing to seek gendered trends, and re-focusing on the authors as the source of gendered interpretation, I realise that I appear to risk falling back into a gender essentialism that is even less useful than [the textual frameworks of male and female gothics.] [But, first, it is my question rather than my conclusion, to ask whether men and women wrote differently.] [And, second, if I do find such a difference, I will take this as a reflection of social constraints on the lived experiences of men and women in the eighteenth century, rather than biological essentialism.] [It is possible that women had special license to express certain politics / sympathies [TODO: cite someone on this in a footnote]. [It is equally possible men had special license to write gross books.] [TODO: cite someone on this in a footnote] [Either finding would support a “women’s gothic” or “men’s gothic” in which authorial gender shaped a work’s creation, but according to the particular context and social pressures of late eighteenth century gender norms, not due to differences that are inherent or universal.] [Thus, I research gender while avoiding gender essentialism.]

#

My methods emphasize the continuities between computational approaches to literature and the the venerable tradition of archival bibliographical research. Heather Love has notably turned to sociological microanalysis as a model for 'thin description' close-but-not-deep reading methods; I employ 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)[[9]](#footnote-8) but with the reward that “one could—at least ideally—pay equal attention to every aspect … and record it faithfully.”[[10]](#footnote-9) 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.”[[11]](#footnote-10) It is the work of accounting for real variety that both bibliography and computation demand: the system must have a way to cope with odd cases. A program which is unprepared for all potential inputs will simply fail to run (often in a spectacular manner). A bibliography can be more generous — one can still physically print a book that contains omissions — but the systematic presentation of bibliography information will leave obvious gaps if the bibliographer does not, e.g., provide a name in the designated space for “author”. Even if one simply skips over the oddity, or adds an explanatory footnote or a comment within one’s code, one must make a choice about how to proceed; outliers must be acknowledged and grappled with. I use computational interventions to interrogate the literary models represented in two older bibliographies. In so doing, I argue, I demonstrate the ongoing utility of qualitative description, as a promising avenue toward revisiting older scholarship and re-forging connections with the work that has come before.

#

Johanna Drucker has given compelling warnings about the dangers of treating constructed information as empirically objective “data” which may then be passively “visualized”.[[12]](#footnote-11) 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.[[13]](#footnote-12) Whether a model is a reading or a bar chart, the worth of that model must be judged by its “fruitfulness”[[14]](#footnote-13), a term for which Stephen Ramsay provides a useful definition: “the robustness of the discussion that a particular procedure annunciates”[[15]](#footnote-14). In other words, whether or not the model has revealed what we expected to see, a fruitful model has revealed something with which we must now engage. This flexibility 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. It is also worth noting that not all models are computational, as is evidenced by 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.[[16]](#footnote-15) As Price observes, when scholars examine texts — when we take notes on them, extract quotes for close reading, summarize or categorize scenes or subplots — 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. [Conclusion sentence: we can use “capta” fruitfully, as long as we are thoughtful about our methods of capture.]

#

Over the course of three literary experiments, in which I model the early Gothic novel by means of bibliographic records, I ask whether the hundreds of women writing Gothic novels wrote observably different books than the hundreds of men doing the same. This project ultimately reinforces Ledoux’s argument that the Female Gothic is a retroactive critical creation. Frederick Frank’s critical categories paint a picture of Radcliffe as the centre of a group of female, sentimental copiers. But Ann Tracy’s less-critically-mediated details present us with a largely undifferentiated gothic mainstream, in which the only gendered pocket is a group of male writers whose gender gives them license to go to extremes. [Add more emphasis to my major claim, which follows in the next sentence?] In the field of Gothic studies, this work suggests that we can fold the “female Gothic” into the unmarked category of “the Gothic mainstream,” and begin an exploration of a “men’s Gothic.” Because Frank and Tracy support such different conclusions [based on ostensibly the same body of texts], my work also suggests [that we need increased skepticism of the biases built into the very data-collection of all research]] [must always remember that “data” is in fact “capta,” even/especially “data” which does not present itself as such. Especially crucial for feminist/anti-oppressive scholars]

2. Frederick Frank's "Gothic types"

TODO: increase emphasis on argument, subjectivity of “capta”

#

[Frederick Frank has an important role on the literary history of the Gothic.] [TODO: summarize his bibliography; nod to the importance of these contributions] The First Gothics was published in 1987 [TODO: contextualize in his output] and provides listings for 499 works, [YEARS]. He offers a “Gothic Type” and a “Critical Synopsis” of each text to place it within the critical consensus. His “Critical Synopsis” often provides very few plot details in favour of describing the work’s literary borrowings, narrative structure, and historical reception.[[17]](#footnote-16) These miniature essays are always at least a paragraph long, and often exceed a full page; they capture impressive nuance and context. His Gothic “types” are not stable overarching categories: for his 500 texts, Frank provides 309 unique classifications.[[18]](#footnote-17) 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). [Frank is not in the business of applying firm labels.] Instead, Frank’s 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. [Thus his details come to us already interpreted]

#

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 single 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.[[19]](#footnote-18) This process generated 190 unique tags, most of which only apply 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 of 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.

#

TODO: increase emphasis on argument, subjectivity of “capta”

#

Figure 1: [TODO: add a table of these most widespread tags.]

#

For the most part, however, Frank’s bibliography resists division into a gendered binary. As Figure 1 shows, the two most prevalent tags in the corpus as a whole are “Gothic” (83% of all works) and “pure/high” (39%), both of which have the same gendered distribution of the sample as a whole. [Comment on this.] Our only hint of a gendered trend among the most widespread tags is the third most prevalent tag, “terror” (34% of works), which, at 50% female, is somewhat above the female baseline of 43%. Instead, the most prevalent tags highlight the subjectivity of interpretation [/multiplicity of Frank’s assessments?] built into Frank’s “gothic types”. The tags “mode” and “elements,” for example, are each applied to 27% of all works in the sample. These terms 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: each work assembles multiple elements, which have their sources elsewhere, and are all interconnected. [Nothing for Frank is just one genre.](scrivcmt://78015818-051E-4066-A715-A60118435993) Even horror and terror 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. The only part that’s consistent with the conventional narrative is that terror vastly outnumbers horror. [Reiterate that this matters also because it means all of his information comes to us already interpreted.]

#

[Transition: mathematically, the norm is always going to be dominated by that which both sexes can participate in. (The maximum prevalence an exclusively-female trait can have is 50%). Since Frank indexes slightly more female authors than male[[20]](#footnote-19), the female maximum is actually 43%. With that limit in mind, we can look at tags for which women or men are overrepresented by looking at their odds ratios.] [EXPLAIN ODDS RATIOS. 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.” [Or, as odds ratios, [terror odds ratio], [radcliffean odds ratio], [sentimental odds ratio], compared to the null hypothesis of 50/50 men and women = odds ratio of 1.]]

#

Figure 2: [TODO: add a table of tags in which women are over-represented.]

#

Figure 3: [TODO: add a table of tags in which men are over-represented.]

#

Figure <$n#:figs:femaleFranks> shows the most female-dominated tags, and Figure <$n#:figs:maleFranks> the most male-dominate. Figure <$n#:figs:femaleFranks> can be used to support a category of the “Female Gothic,” and even point toward a definition of it. [The correlation of female authorship with [WHATEVER]] implicitly describes a Radcliffean, sentimental, terror Gothic which is also a women’s Gothic.[[21]](#footnote-20)

#

[[22]](#footnote-21) In contrast, 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). However, when a tag is strongly male dominated, it generally applies to only a few novels, [giving the impression that the work/tag is a one-off] rather than a gendered school. On the rare occasion that we find a “Germanic” work, such as the X total unsigned “Germanic” works, it is X% more likely to have been written by a man than a woman— and this is the strongest predictor of male authorship that we have. Or, in the more common case that we find a “terror” work (X unsigned), a “Radcliffean” work (X unsigned), or a “sentimental” work (X unsigned), these are, respectively, X%, X%, or X% more likely to have been written by a woman. This examination of Frank’s Gothic types has revealed some gendered currents, but none that are sufficient to begin making predictions about the many unsigned works. [Remember my claim: “this work suggests that we can fold the “female Gothic” into the unmarked category of “the Gothic mainstream,” and begin an exploration of a “men’s Gothic.”” Also: rich description is fruitful when the “capta” are more explicit.] [Transition to next section]

3. Ann Tracy's "Gothic motifs"

Ann Tracy, unlike Frank, [is not a household name (how to not sound dismissive?? Imagine Tracy will read this)] in Gothic studies. [Something more about Tracy?] Her 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,” which identifies 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. Unlike Frank’s highly-variable “Gothic types,” these motifs are already systematically standardized. The index is intended for “scholars with particular interests”[[23]](#footnote-22), 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 excludes the most popular motifs: “the abundance of murders,” she says, “argued for the retention… of specialized murders only,”[[24]](#footnote-23) 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.”[[25]](#footnote-24) She makes no mention of the critical assessments or literary intertextuality which make up the majority of Frank’s synopses. As a model of the Gothic, then, Tracy’s bibliography elides similarities between novels to increase her 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. These motifs are also, therefore, more replicable and extensible than Frank’s gothic types: Tracy includes an explicit description of her methodology, [rendering the method of capture for her “capta” to be more obvious/explicit ]. [Allows it to be imaginable that another scholar could expand on her work / integrate new details]

#

I take Tracy’s model to its logical extension by foregrounding her motifs. I distilled her index of 208 motifs into 92 motifs which appear in at least 20 works[[26]](#footnote-25), as seen in Figure 4. 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. [In contrast to the [unhelpfulness] of Frank], an identifiable gendered school immediately emerges from Tracy’s motifs: 38 distinctly male-authored motifs[[27]](#footnote-26) describe a men’s Gothic, defined by extreme horror tropes.

#

Figure 4: [TODO: add a table of Tracy’s motifs.]

#

Figure 5: [TODO: add a table of male and female motifs.]

#

Comparing these male-dominated motifs to the neutral or female-dominated motifs, as seen in Figure 5, involves constant escalation. Women may write about libertines ([64%](scrivcmt://EA6F7CF9-381D-4B42-8300-1D090C9DE905) 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 these “almost” incests make 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. Instead, in Tracy’s 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). It is easy to start drawing conclusions from these findings, inventing the binary opposites of the conclusions we drew about Frank. 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 frequent usage of all four 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 narrow margin of difference for each motif suggests that defining a women’s gothic at all may be too hasty. The male motifs consist of a variety of elements used by many different men, such that no one author could be responsible for the motif’s gendered correlation. 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. None of the four motifs, then, show a sufficiently widespread use among female authors to support further theorization. When it comes to the inclusion of particular story elements, this women’s Gothic is outnumbered not just by the men’s Gothic but also by the mainstream Gothic.

#

TODO: Revise this paragraph so evidence more strongly points to argument

#

More than half of the motifs under consideration are not strongly gendered in either direction: [as with Frank, we primarily see a Gothic mainstream / almost tautologically, the Gothic mainstream/majority is defined by… the mainstream]. Four motifs are even perfect ties: elopement (all subcategories); duelling and other single combat; fainting, female; and rediscovery of lost relatives. 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. As with Frank, 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[[28]](#footnote-27) 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. [Conclude with some kind of argument: I feel like I’m contradicting myself — is my argument that the Gothic is basically ungendered, or is it that we need to pay attention to the Men’s Gothic?? “this work suggests that we can fold the “female Gothic” into the unmarked category of “the Gothic mainstream,” and begin an exploration of a “men’s Gothic.”” Also: rich description is fruitful when the “capta” are more explicit.]

4. Conclusions

It is possible to computationally test the question of “can this information be used to classify these items according to these categories?” [“Supervised” machine learning uses a “training set” and a “testing set” of data] [There are many machine learning “binary classifiers” use existing classified data to infer a method for future classification] Cross-validation allows us to use the same set of data for both training and testing. Five-fold cross-validation, for example, divides a dataset (such as a spreadsheet of all of Ann Tracy’s motifs and the books in which they appear) into five equal parts. The binary classifier “trains” on the first four parts of the dataset, calculating which motifs correlate most strongly with male or female authorship. Then it “tests” on the fifth part of the dataset, attempting to predict authorial gender for those works, and then checking its prediction against the actual recorded gender to calculate the classifier’s accuracy. This process then repeats four more times to reduce inaccuracy associated with sampling bias, by letting each of the five subsets of the dataset takes a turn as the “test” set. Using a supervised machine learning binary classifier with a dataset asks the question: can this classifier use this data to make accurate predictions? A failure could indicate that the classifier is unsuited to the task, that the data insufficiently correlates to the categories, or that no difference exists between the two groups.

[I tried multiple binary classifiers with lacklustre results.] The highest accuracy I got was 66%,[[29]](#footnote-28) using only Frank’s tags. The highest I could achieve with Tracy was 59%. [Not even worth running on the “unsigned” works I have data for] [What I learned from this attempt at binary classification is mostly that no, these aren’t very good ways at guessing authorial gender. The thing that comes closest is decoding the language of someone (Frank) who KNEW the gender when he wrote and could easily have been influenced by subconscious bias.] [Maybe different data would build a better classifier, or maybe supervised machine learning (with a support vector machine) could classify better based on this data, but frankly, on the strength of these results, I wouldn’t pursue one.]

#

TODO?? Experiment again, trying all 5 binary classifiers explained here: <https://machinelearningmastery.com/use-classification-machine-learning-algorithms-weka/>

#

[It is tantalizingly tempting to draw conclusions anyway from small samples[[30]](#footnote-29) but we will be less accurate.] In the case of this classifier experiment, Frank-Tracy-inner-join actually REDUCED accuracy, down to 60%, because it also reduced the size of the sample.] [But, more broadly, half the existence of the “Female Gothic” framework seems like it can be chalked up to reasoning overmuch from small samples.] [?This was Ledoux’s argument: “QUOTE”] [As a concrete example, we can consider the conventional association of subterranean passages with the Female Gothic.] [TODO: cite a few folks who talk about subterranean passages / caves / secret doors as a Female Gothic trope.] [At its most biologically essentialist, X has even said “SOMETHING EXTRA ESSENTIALIST ABOUT SECRET CAVERNS”] However, [Tracy’s bibliography in fact shows that ] 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, as seen in Figure <$n#:figs:caves>. 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. [We have learned, from Tracy, a valuable lesson about small sample sizes.]

#

Figure 6: TODO: figure-ify the top 10 authors for subterranean passages and caves.

#

[The other thing we learned from the classifier is that it is tantalizingly tempting to continue onward with someone else’s implicit bias.] [Frank was (marginally) more accurate because his “capta” were captured implicitly shaped by his knowledge of authorial gender — which creates a classifier that will do better on its tests, but which can’t handle new information that is captured without Frank’s specific, individual, implicit bias.] My computer scientist collaborator expressed [this] as “machines love data, and machines love it if you give them hints”: if “sentimental” is [a female-coded term / code word for “female”], the classifier will [seize/expand/extrapolate from] that implicit bias and perpetuate it. Revisiting Frank’s terminology with an eye for these coded shades of difference the interpretive multiplicity which earlier [seemed like a critical strength] now seem like a barrier to [ongoing/extensible study]. [What makes one work “polemical” and another “didactic”, other than the fact that men are much more likely to be “polemical”?] [TODO: several more examples of Frank’s gendered terminology] His “capta” are captured too implicitly/subjectively, so they are best able to tell us “did Frank think this author’s gender played a role in their decisions when he described their genre?”

#

Based on my findings, I suggest that our attention to gender has been exactly the opposite of what is supported by the variety of texts produced under the Gothic umbrella. Although there are some Gothic features which are strongly predictive of male authorship, I find nothing that is the exclusive province of women. [I contradict the claim that “it is rare for male authors to write in the “female” style (Miles, 2000)” (Ledoux 3)] [I was deciding between two theories: Women have special license to express certain politics / sympathies? Men have special license to write gross books? I set aside the first matter (I can’t detect anything notably feminine), but find strong support for the second. Men have special license to be weird and gross.]

But, more than anything, I argue that the mainstream matters. [And that “capta” are useful and extensible when we know where they come from.]
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\* \* \*

1. . a nod to Hans Robert Jauss’s “horizons of expectation” [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
2. . [TODO: Ellen Moers, and some hint from her regarding the limits.] An attention to the diversity of women’s gothic writing is picking up steam. The Female Gothic: New Directions (2009), edited by Andrew Smith and Diana Wallace. Avril Horner’s and Sue Zlosnik’s Edinburgh Companion on Women and the Gothic (2016) [both do things]. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
3. . Emma Clery’s Women’s Gothic (2000). The Female Gothic: New Directions (2009). Wallace D (2013) \*Female Gothic Histories\*. Murphy P (2016) \*The New Woman Gothic\*. [TODO: Robert Miles, Alison Milbank]. Even Barbara Benedict’s “‘Male’ and ‘Female’ Novels?”, which questions the premise of gender division in its title, refers with assurance to “the subgenre of the female Gothic, which emphasized the uncertainties of perception that heroines suffer in an obscure, dangerous, patriarchal world”.⁠1

   irnatural

   irnatural1 CITE p 364 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
4. . CITE Ledoux 2 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
5. . CITE Ledoux 2 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
6. . CITE Ledoux 2 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
7. . CITE Ledoux 3 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
8. . CITE The Gothic Novel and the Lingering Appeal of Romance p 479 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
9. . CITE Heather Love, Thin Description, p. 404 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
10. . CITE Heather Love, Thin Description. p. 407 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
11. . CITE Love 377 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
12. . cite Drucker [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
13. . cite McCarty [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
14. . cite McCarty [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
15. . cite Ramsay [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
16. . cite Leah Price [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
17. . The two bibliographies’ treatments of Grenville Fletcher’s *Rosalviva, Or, The Demon Dwarf*, for example, serves as a useful illustration of their differences. Tracy’s summary is a litany of events: it begins matter-of-factly with the sentence “Leontini loves Viola di Morini, but she marries someone else,” and is equally unfazed when the titular “demon dwarf” arrives in the third act and when the dwarven appearance turns out to be false (51). Frank, in contrast, spends more than half his words on context, as in his first sentence:

    irnatural“From Rumplestilskin in the fairytale to the comic evil of Dickens’s Daniel Quilp in The Old Curiosity Shop (1841), the figure of the dwarf was often called upon to perform such demonic services as vengeance, prophecy, child possession, and transformation.” (107)

    To this broad literary history he adds Mary Shelley’s story “Transformation” as potential precursor for the disguise in Fletcher’s novel, and includes several assessments of the Gothic’s particular embellishments of “the dwarf as a resolver of dilemmas of identity” (107) and “dwarfs... spin[ning] webs of murderous intrigue for diabolic ladies” (108). All of these details stand in stark contrast to Tracy’s unembellished list of seven novels under the index entry “dwarf” (199), which treats the sinister disguise in *Rosalviva* as interchangeable with depictions of non-supernatural and even non-evil little people. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
18. . Most of these are “unique” primarily from the point of view of a spreadsheet: “Domestic fiction (various Gothic elements)” and “Domestic fiction (intermittent Gothic elements),” for example, are distinguished only by a slight gradation of degree. But this interest in slight qualitative gradations is what distinguishes Frank’s model from Tracy’s. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
19. . First, Frank’s phrases were split so that each word became one tag. Radcliffe’s The Italian, listed as “Pure or high Gothic (terror and horror modes)” becomes “Pure”, “or”, “high”, “Gothic”, “terror”, “horror”, and “modes.” Then, conjunctions were deleted, and synonyms combined. Frank always uses the phrase “Pure or high” in its entirety, for example, so the tags “Pure”, “or”, and “high” were merged into one tag “Pure;high”. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
20. . His corpus is 43% female, 31% male, 26% unknown. Tracy’s is 50% female,  45% male, 5% unknown. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
21. . if I WANT to say stuff about the sentimental, it can go in this footnote. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
22. . The conventional narrative of sentimental literature is strikingly similar to that of Gothic literature. [TODO: Quote some folks about sentimental literature.] To find the sentimental tied to the female Gothic here initially points toward a revival of an older history of the Gothic. [TODO: pull in all that stuff from my previous drafts] [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
23. . cite Tracy 195 [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
24. . cite tracy 195 [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
25. . cite tracy 74 [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
26. . Due to Tracy’s interest in uniqueness, 138 of the 208 motifs she indexes appear in fewer than 20 novels, and have thus been excluded from this study. Most motifs contain a number of sub-categories. In most cases, I further distilled each motif to its simplest form by ignoring these sub-categories. “Poison,” for example, is indexed with categories for “blade,” “chaplet,” “kiss,” “letter,” “orange,” “plant on grave,” and “sacrificial wine”, but I have elided these nuances in favor of a broader motif of “poison (all subcategories),” which applies to 30 novels. In cases where a sub-category contains more than 20 novels in and of itself, I have graphed that sub-category as if it were its own motif. “Death,” for example, is divided into the sub-categories “emotionally induced,” “pre-nuptial,” and “sad and/or pious,” of which both “emotionally induced” and “sad/pious” include more than 20 novels. Ultimately, the 70 key motifs generated 92 charts. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
27. . I interpret a motif to be “distinctly male” if 60% or more of its authors are male. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
28. . That is, the defining features of the Gothic which nonetheless struck Ann Tracy as singular enough to be worth indexing — castles, for example, might have topped this list, if they hadn’t been considered too common to index. However, convents, ghosts, and corpses were all indexed and thus in the running for defining motifs, but were insufficiently prevalent. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
29. . With Logistic — “ logistic regression - maps a real-valued input to the range 0 to 1” [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
30. . I am by no means immune to this temptation: I have written many [fascinating-to-me/persuasive] paragraphs about the gendered implication of [↑](#footnote-ref-29)