

“THOSE CURIOUS, SLOPING LETTERS”: READING THE WRITING OF DU MAURIER’S *Rebecca*

Avril Horner and Sue Zlosnik

University of Salford and Liverpool Hope University College

Daphne du Maurier’s work has received relatively little critical attention. The most interesting recent reading of *Rebecca*, by Alison Light, first appeared in *Feminist Review* in 1984; a socialist materialist interpretation, it examined du Maurier’s novel mainly in relation to the dynamics of class. In this influential article, reprinted in Terry Lovell’s *British Feminist Thought* in 1990, Light focuses on female sexuality as a class construct:

Rebecca marks an outpost in the late 1930s, a transitional moment historically and fictionally, when the demands of middle-class femininity could be discussed and even dismantled with a public and popular form like romance. It demarcates a feminine subjectivity which is hopelessly split within bourgeois gendered relations. The girl’s autobiography of gendered experience dramatises the contradictory pressures which middle-class sexual ideologies were to place upon women, pressures which were in some measure to be responsible for their politicisation some thirty years later. (Light 1990, 340)

Light’s reading was invaluable in establishing *Rebecca* as a text worthy of serious feminist interest; however, we wish in this article to focus on the novel from a different perspective, and to discuss it as a work which reveals deep ambivalence about women and the power of writing. For what critics of *Rebecca* have not yet examined in any depth is the fact that Rebecca, the character, is above all connected with *writing*. Her strong presence in the novel is due not just to other characters’ memories of her but to an indelibility which continually surfaces in her signature and the “curious, sloping letters” (du Maurier 1975, 62) of her handwriting. The first instance of this occurs in Chapter 4 when the narrator, finding a book of poetry in the glove compartment of Maxim’s car, takes it back to the hotel to read. Picking up the book later, the narrator notices the dedication:

‘Max - from Rebecca. 17 May’, written in a curious slanting hand. A little blob of ink marred the white page opposite, as though the writer, in impatience, had shaken her pen to make the ink flow freely. And then as it bubbled through the nib, it came a little thick, so that the name Rebecca stood out black and strong, the tall and sloping R dwarfing the other letters. (du Maurier 1975, 37)

This is the first of many references to Rebecca's writing that we meet in the novel; always it is associated with "curious", "sloping" or "slanting" letters and a signature which is "black and strong"; moreover it always suggests extreme confidence to the narrator - to the point, sometimes, of aggression:

Max from Rebecca...Max was her choice, the word was her choice, the word was her possession; she had written it with so great a confidence on the fly-leaf of that book. That bold, slanting hand, stabbing the white paper, the symbol of herself, so certain, so assured. (du Maurier 1975, 47-48)

Significantly, then, Maxim talks about wishing to "blot out" memories of his first marriage and assures the narrator that she has "blotted out the past" (du Maurier 1975, 43) for him. The narrator is not convinced by such reassurances, however, and still feels threatened by Rebecca:

How alive was her writing, though, how full of force. Those curious sloping letters. The blob of ink. Done yesterday. It was just as if it had been written yesterday. (du Maurier 1975, 62)

In desperation, "looking over my shoulder like a criminal", she cuts out the offending page and tears it into pieces which she throws into the waste-paper basket - only to find that "the ink stood up on the fragments thick and black, the writing was not destroyed" (du Maurier 1975, 62). So, in an episode which portends the end of *Rebecca* when Manderley will be burnt to the ground (itself an episode which "rewrites" the plot of *Jane Eyre*), she sets fire to the paper:

I took a box of matches and set fire to the fragments. The flame had a lovely light, staining the paper, curling the edges, making the slanting writing impossible to distinguish. The fragments fluttered to grey ashes. The letter R was the last to go, it twisted in the flame, it curled outwards for a moment, becoming larger than ever. Then it crumpled too; the flame destroyed it. It was not ashes even, it was feathery dust ... I went and washed my hands in the basin. I felt better, much better. I had the clean new feeling that one has when the calendar is hung on the wall at the beginning of the year. January the 1st. I was aware of the same freshness, the same gay confidence. (du Maurier 1975, 62-3)

For a time the narrator lives with the illusion that, by destroying Rebecca's writing, she has taken on her enemy's strength; she, too, is now confident and strong: "A new confidence had been born in me when I burnt that page and scattered the fragments" (du Maurier 1975, 65). This state is, however, short-lived - not surprisingly

since, as we shall see, it is not the destruction of Rebecca's writing but the absorption of the power which it signifies that will enable the narrator to find her voice and to write. Rebecca, of course, has not been destroyed and her presence surfaces again and again, haunting the narrator and driving her to despair. The narrator finds Rebecca's handkerchief in the mackintosh she used to wear and it is embroidered with "A tall sloping R, with the letters de W interlaced" (du Maurier 1975, 125); later, when she enters Rebecca's bedroom, she sees that her night-dress case is similarly embroidered with "R de W, interwoven and interlaced. The letters were corded and strong against the golden satin material" (du Maurier 1975, 175).

We would suggest that the constant reiteration of the letter R is a reminder to the reader of the symbolic nature of writing. It is a commonplace that an initial "stands for" something or someone; the pervasiveness of the letter prompts us to ask what "R" signifies beyond Rebecca's name. It is possible, of course, to see the letter R as an iconic representation of a woman's form; its curved formation and pinched-in waist inscribe an exaggerated femininity on the shape of the female body.¹ Yet the letter also has a runic power which derives from its powerful visual impact and its refusal to be destroyed: it appears and re-appears in different guises, from boldly-etched black ink to the "corded and strong" monogram, with the tall sloping R dominating, on the gold satin material of the night-dress case. Moreover, its disproportionately large and dominant presence is reminiscent of the famous signature of Elizabeth I, the mark of an unusually powerful woman.² Whereas the scent of azaleas, which still pervades Rebecca's clothing, signifies for the narrator an exotic female adult sexuality, the dominating R which cannot be burnt away, erased or blotted out, signifies for the reader an enduring autonomy which is perpetuated through Rebecca's writing and, indeed, through du Maurier's writing of *Rebecca*. Rebecca's writing leaves an indelible trace on Manderley which can only be erased by the destruction of the house itself yet that same writing returns in the text which is *Rebecca* the novel. Thus Rebecca's inevitable return is presaged by the resurfacing of her boat, prophetically named *Je Reviens*.

Rebecca's writing initially appears to tell the tale of an ideal wife, loving towards her husband and the perfect hostess for his elegant country mansion. However, the letters themselves suggest a different story. The very first reference in the novel to Rebecca's writing indicates her power to name and to possess: only she calls Maxim 'Max' and this is what appears in the inscription on the flyleaf of the book. The narrator's reaction suggests that she is intimidated by the power that the inscription implies ("That bold, slanting hand, stabbing at the white paper, the symbol of herself, so certain, so assured") but also that she instinctively perceives the power of writing itself: "the word was her choice, the word was her possession; she had written it with so great a confidence on the fly-leaf of that book" (du Maurier 1975, 47-48). Later, installed at Manderley, the narrator finds herself at Rebecca's writing table:

But this writing-table, beautiful as it was, was no pretty toy where a woman would scribble little notes, nibbling the end of a pen ... The pigeon-holes were docketed, 'letters unanswered', 'letters-to-keep', 'household', 'estate', 'menus', 'miscellaneous', 'addresses';

each ticket written in that same scrawling pointed hand that I knew already. And it shocked me, even startled me, to recognise it again, for I had not seen it since I had destroyed the page from the book of poems, and I had not thought to see it again. ... She who sat here before me had not wasted her time, as I was doing ... She would tear off sheet after sheet of that smooth white paper, using it extravagantly, because of the long strokes she made when she wrote, and at the end of each of her personal letters she put her signature, "Rebecca", that tall sloping R dwarfing its fellows. (du Maurier 1975, 90; 92-3)

Here, Rebecca's writing is much in evidence, proof of her efficiency and appearing to reinforce the portrait of the ideal wife. Again, however, the power and autonomy implicit in Rebecca's writing are what impress themselves on both the narrator and the reader. Thus, there is a duality in Rebecca's writing, appearing to tell one story but giving the lie to it in the very physical appearance of the writing itself. This deceptiveness is also embodied in her name which, deriving from the Hebrew meaning "knotted cord" indicates that, just as a knotted cord should hold firm, so a woman with the name "Rebecca" would be a firm and faithful wife (Johnson and Sleigh 1962, 173); in fact, of course, this particular "knotted cord" (represented by the interwoven nature of Rebecca's monogram) metamorphoses into the hank of hair which nearly strangles Maxim in the narrator's dream.³

Rebecca's handwriting is significantly contrasted throughout the novel with the narrator's, which is "small" and "square", "cramped and unformed" with all the intimations of inhibition, uniformity and immaturity that these suggest:

I could think of nobody to write to ... I took up the narrow, slender pen, with the bright pointed nib. 'Dear Mrs. Van Hopper', I began. And as I wrote ... I noticed for the first time how cramped and unformed was my own hand-writing; without individuality, without style, uneducated even, the writing of an indifferent pupil taught in a second-rate school. (du Maurier 1975, 93)

Yet it is this narrator who writes the powerful tale of Rebecca; she can, however, only do so by modifying her perception of Rebecca as 'other' and assimilating some of that autonomy. Indeed, we learn at the beginning of the novel that the narrator *has* finally acquired the confidence for which she envied Rebecca as a young woman: "and confidence is a quality I prize, although it has come to me a little late in the day" (du Maurier 1975, 13). The conclusion must be that only with Rebecca "really" dead can she write Rebecca's story, although it is only *through* Rebecca that she can write. Significantly, then, in the final dream of the novel the narrator finds herself writing *as* Rebecca:

I was writing letters in the morning-room. I was sending out

invitations. I wrote them all myself with a thick black pen. But when I looked down to see what I had written it was not my small square handwriting at all, it was long, and slanting, with curious pointed strokes. I pushed the cards away from the blotter and hid them. I got up and went to the looking-glass. A face stared back at me that was not my own. It was very pale, very lovely, framed in a cloud of dark hair. The eyes narrowed and smiled. The lips parted. The face in the glass stared back at me and laughed. And I saw then that she was sitting on a chair before the dressing-table in her bedroom and Maxim was brushing her hair. He held her hair in his hands, and as he brushed it he wound it slowly into a thick rope. It twisted like a snake, and he took hold of it with both hands and smiled at Rebecca and put it round his neck.

'No', I screamed. 'No, no. We must go to Switzerland. Colonel Julyan said we must go to Switzerland'. (du Maurier 1975, 395-6)

Whereas the firing of Manderley offers a plot closure which relates the 'story' of the novel to *Jane Eyre*, the dream offers a psychic closure which has to do with an alternative hidden narrative concerning women, writing and power. Such a power is, of course, threatening to men, as the dream itself metaphorically suggests. The intertwining nature of the monogram, in which the 'de W' is overshadowed by the boldness of the R, becomes translated into a sinister physical intimacy in the vivid world of the narrator's nightmare. Maxim becomes complicitous in his own destruction in a way that undermines the supposed affirmation of heterosexual desire in the novel, since in the dream we are never clear whether the threatening female is Rebecca or the narrator-as-Rebecca. The 'other woman' is here "at the same time the Heroine's double and her opposite", a classic feature of the female Gothic text, according to Joanna Russ (Fleenor 1983, 33). Significantly, then, the Maxim we see in the opening chapters is a broken man whose relationship with his wife has been reduced prematurely to the passionless companionship of old age in a marriage that is childless. In pursuing the object of her desire, the narrator seems to have emasculated him: rather than redirecting Maxim's desire, she has killed it - and once again the novel's superficial endorsement of heterosexuality is undermined.⁴ All this would perhaps seem to suggest that it is not simply Rebecca's sexuality that is threatening but the unleashed power of writing, an inherently ambiguous and potentially duplicitous power which asserts the female presence.

The fascination which Rebecca holds for the narrator therefore cannot be defined purely through the sexual. Certainly there *are* intimations of 'deviant' sexual desire in the novel: Mrs. Danvers' devotion to Rebecca carries lesbian undertones; Jack Favell's desires are presented as degenerate; Rebecca's own sexuality is, it is implied, multi-faceted and voracious. These desires are, however, condemned by a plot which rewards, albeit ambiguously, the virtuous (that is the sexually conformist) characters. Moreover, Rebecca's sexuality is only part of an assertion of self which cannot be constrained and

which gives rise to a scripted presence which cannot be erased. Although the narrator harbours a deep distrust and fear of Rebecca's sexuality, she also harbours a desire *to be like* Rebecca: consciously she wishes to be the model wife and hostess she believes Rebecca to be; unconsciously she wishes for her sexual and *textual* charisma. It is, however, this very charisma that disrupts conventional notions of gender and sexuality, its runic pattern creating a semiotic which disturbs and dislocates the reader's expectations at a subliminal level. To some extent the fear and fascination that Rebecca's script holds for the narrator is inflected in the novel by various characters' suspicion of writing as an effete activity which destabilises gender boundaries as they were perceived in the 1930s: against the importance of writing and script for Rebecca and the narrator (and Mrs. Danvers), for example, we have Max's airy insistence that "Writing letters is a waste of time" (du Maurier 1975, 147), Colonel Julyan's worry that his son will insist on writing poetry (with the implication that he should have been the daughter), and Frank's assurance that he, too, wrote poetry when adolescent but grew out of it: "I never write any now" - 'Good heavens, I should hope not', said Maxim" (du Maurier 1975, 308). Conversely, Mrs. Danvers associates Rebecca's writing with her strength and authority, which are coupled with masculinity:

What do you think it's meant to me all these months knowing that you wrote at her desk in the morning-room, using the very pen that she used, speaking down the house-telephone, where she used to speak every morning of her life to me, ever since she first came to Manderley? ... She had all the courage and spirit of a boy, had my Mrs. de Winter. She ought to have been a boy, I often told her that. (du Maurier 1975, 253)

Writing itself, then, is seen to offer a challenge to the binary oppositions enshrined in the social construction of gender during the 1930s: writing represents the threat of effeminacy for men in du Maurier's fictional world, but is associated with strength for women, a strength that is desired, since it is connected with power, control and visibility (the indelible presence) yet also feared, since these very features connote masculinity within the culture of England in the 1930s.

Such an ambivalence towards the power of writing is articulated more openly in du Maurier's autobiographical works. Here she defines writing as an activity which gave her access to a 'masculine' self which not only fuelled her creative energies, but which also allowed her to adopt masculine personae through which she could express a desire for women (for example in *My Cousin Rachel*, *The Scapegoat* and *The House on the Strand*). Margaret Forster's recent biography of du Maurier reveals attitudes to authorship which illuminate a reading of *Rebecca* and suggest that du Maurier saw herself as having more in common with Rebecca than with the narrator, despite the fact that, on the set for the Hitchcock film of the novel, made in 1940, the nameless narrator was called 'Daphne'. Du Maurier's early convictions that she was 'really' a boy gave rise to what she called her 'boy-in-the-box' syndrome, which betokened a shutting away of 'masculine' characteristics, including a desire for women. She later wrote of her

feelings for other women as her 'Venetian tendencies' (as opposed to her 'Cairo' heterosexual tendencies) and these desires finally found expression in a physical relationship with the actress Gertrude Lawrence and a deep love for Ellen Doubleday (a letter to the latter speaks of du Maurier feeling like "a boy of eighteen all over again with nervous hands and a beating heart" on first meeting the American woman) (Forster 1993, 221). Yet du Maurier married and had three children and, in many ways, presented an utterly conventional front. Rather like the character Janet in *The Loving Spirit* (du Maurier's first novel, published in 1931), "One half ... wanted to be a conventional wife and mother, the other to be 'part of a ship ... and the seas'" (Forster 1993, 76). (Like Rebecca, du Maurier loved boats and possessed one of her own from the age of 21.) She violently eschewed the label of 'lesbian' - "... by God and by Christ if anyone should call that sort of love by that unattractive word that begins with 'L', I'd tear their guts out" - and instead saw herself as "a half-breed", that is, bi-sexual (Forster 1993, 222). Not surprisingly, du Maurier often felt that she lived a lie, pretending to be sweet, kind and orthodox on the outside whilst unconventional feelings and desires raged within; Rebecca, of course, acts out those desires without shame or inhibition and is punished for them. We can assume then, that du Maurier polarised these conflicting aspects of herself as the narrator (? de Winter) and Rebecca (de Winter), a 'splitting' or 'doubling' which gives rise to the dream at the end of the novel and which becomes the subject of a letter written to Maureen Baker-Munton in 1975:

What is past is also future. I wrote as the second Mrs de W. twenty-one years ago, with Rebecca a symbol of Jan. It could also be that the Sixpence in Fowey is the second Mrs de W. and I - in Moper's dark mind - can be the symbol of Rebecca. The cottage on the beach could be my hut. Rebecca's lovers could be my books ... The evil in us comes to the surface. Unless we recognise it in time, accept it, understand it, we are all destroyed, just as the people in *The Birds* were destroyed. (Forster 1993, 424)⁵

The "evil" in Rebecca is, then, not simply that of aberrant sexuality, but also of the scripting of the self - a narcissistic, 'unfeminine' desire which makes its claims via an uncompromising egotism signalled by the indelibility and intrusiveness of Rebecca's script. Significantly du Maurier saw her writing career as having given her "a masculine approach to life" (Forster 1993, 232) and as having sprung from what - adopting Jung's vocabulary of duality - she described as her repressed "No. 2", masculine side. Writing to her 17 year-old daughter she explained: "When I get madly boyish No. 2 is in charge, and then, after a bit, the situation is reversed" (Forster 1993, 276). As Forster notes, "She explained that when she was writing she felt all No. 2 - 'he certainly has a lot to do with my writing' - but when she was not, No. 2 caused trouble" (Forster 1993, 276).

We would suggest, then, that du Maurier's best-seller of 1938 articulates the author's own ambivalence about the power of the writing woman: whereas the surface plot is concerned with eradicating the sexually voracious woman, what we might call the interstitial plot is concerned with ambiguously celebrating the power of the woman who

writes. This latter plot is to be distinguished from Sandra M. Gilbert's and Susan Gubar's notion of the palimpsestic text, which they define as a set of "submerged meanings" in works by women writing within "male-devised" genres (Gilbert and Gubar 1979, 72). Gilbert and Gubar's influential book, *The Madwoman in the Attic*, addresses itself to the analysis of texts by canonised women writers and dismisses the strategy of writing within 'lesser' genres as an acceptance of the "'parsley wreath' of self-denial" (Gilbert and Gubar 1979, 72). Yet, from the critic's point of view, there is no reason why split subjectivity, or what Gilbert and Gubar refer to as "female authors 'dramatiz(ing)' their own self-division" (Gilbert and Gubar 1979, 78), should not be traced just as fruitfully within such "lesser" genres. In fact, *Rebecca* is interesting precisely because, situated within the "lesser" genres of mystery writing and women's romantic fiction, it is clearly written from a 'feminine' subject position within patriarchal culture, unlike the works by canonised women authors to which Gilbert and Gubar refer. Yet du Maurier's superficial acceptance of this subject position, which her choice of genre seems to indicate, is undermined by the irruption of "those curious, sloping letters" into the main body of the novel since Rebecca's texts, as we have seen, express a female autonomy and visibility fundamentally at odds with the values of patriarchy. However, whereas the narrator only half intuits the significance of the scripted presence which forces its way into her consciousness, the reader who, unlike the narrator, can move beyond the world of women's romantic fiction, is able to see that du Maurier's choice of this "lesser" genre gives rise to an interstitial plot which explores the relationship between genre and gender so as to query the validity of that very mode of writing.

For du Maurier was aware that *Rebecca* would be read within the conventions of popular romantic fiction, although she herself refused this label and described it as a "'rather grim', even 'unpleasant' ... study in jealousy with nothing of the 'exquisite love story' her publisher claimed it to be" (Forster 1993, 137). She was also aware, as we have seen, that the book could be read in a number of ways in relation to her own life. Although she never refers to what most readers see as an implicit intertextuality with works such as *Jane Eyre* or even Meredith's *Diana of the Crossways*, such intertextuality places the reader of *Rebecca* in an interesting relation to the narrator, who is also a reader, and who has constant recourse to the scenarios of popular romantic fiction in her attempts to interpret her own situation. Indeed, the narrator spends most of the novel attempting to "read" Rebecca, but as the suspended "R" of the latter's name and the quasi-illegible "M" in her engagement diary suggest (by constituting a semiotic of fragmentation and incompleteness within the text), the narrator's reading is shown to be inadequate. However, access to a richer intertextuality allows the reader a more sophisticated reading of her situation than is available to the narrator, whose understanding is constrained by the conventions of popular romantic fiction: "In books men knelt to women, and it would be moonlight. Not at breakfast, not like this" (du Maurier 1975, 57). In a brief article such as this, there is no time to explore the numerous plot parallels with *Jane Eyre*,⁶ but it is worth noting that Charlotte Brontë's novel is a work which foregrounds the relationship between the narrator and the reader - "Reader, I married him" being one of its most resonant statements - and which asserts, somewhat ambiguously perhaps, Jane's victory in her struggle for autonomy. *Diana of*

the Crossways, on the other hand, tells - through a self-conscious narrator - the story of a woman writer's fate, in which she is eventually effaced as a writer and subsumed by an overtly stereotypical romantic plot. (Interestingly, and perhaps coincidentally, Diana's personal maid is called Danvers and is described as an avid reader of popular fiction.) This intertextual relationship with canonised texts which deal with gender, autonomy and writing (and which themselves problematise their relationship to *genres* such as popular romantic fiction and the gothic novel), confirms the presence of an interstitial narrative concerning women and writing in du Maurier's novel. Such a narrative expresses an ambivalence about the impact of writing, with its affirmation of strength and its exploration of split subjectivity, upon the social construction of femininity, superficially endorsed, yet found wanting, in du Maurier's portrayal of the nameless narrator. It also renders the surface plot as inherently contradictory as the historical conditions and ideology which produced it: Rebecca has been erased, yet she remains powerful; the 'happy-ever-after' closure (in fact, the opening of the novel) presents us with a passionless marriage; the narrator, as adult, sexual woman (signified by the wearing of pearls and a black dress) is no longer sexually desired by Maxim. Alison Light's suggestion, then, that the novel "supports in the end the moral superiority of the girl's way of being, thoughtful, diffident, and conventional, over and against the decadence of Rebecca" (Light 1991, 164) is perhaps a questionable reading of a novel which constructs Rebecca as writing woman in its interstices. Such interstitial plotting recalls Jeanette Winterson's notion of writing in milk:

For the Greeks, the hidden life demanded invisible ink. They wrote an ordinary letter and in between the lines set out another letter, written in milk. The document looked innocent enough until one who knew better sprinkled coal-dust over it. What the letter had been no longer mattered; what mattered was the life flaring up undetected ... till now. (Winterson 1989, 10)

This "writing in milk" is to be distinguished, however, from Cixous's exhortation to women to write with "that good mother's milk ... (to write) in white ink" (Marks and de Courtivron 1981, 251) since, for Cixous, *écriture féminine* must inevitably divorce itself from phallogocentrism and begin to break new ground through avant-garde and experimental techniques. Winterson's metaphor for finding the hidden meanings enables us to read apparently conventional novels, such as *Rebecca*, in new and interesting ways; it also helps us redeem much women's writing that, superficially at least, seems to endorse the conservative gender rules adhered to by many authors of romantic fiction. Sprinkling *Rebecca* with the coal-dust of feminism, we can discern a novel which embodies a radical ambivalence towards the validity of romantic fiction: within its reworking of the stereotypical plot featuring 'the other woman', there lies an interstitial narrative concerning women and the anxiety of writing which, whilst seeming to affirm conventional values, simultaneously undercuts them. It is, perhaps, partly this deep-seated ambivalence which gives *Rebecca* its enduring appeal.

ENDNOTES

¹ We owe this point to Michael Parker.

² We owe this point to Peter Childs.

³ It is worth noting here that David Selznick, the producer of Hitchcock's film version of *Rebecca*, had misgivings about the film's title, commenting that it would not do "unless it was made for the Palestine market" (Shallcross 1991, 69-70). Du Maurier's presentation of Maxim's wife as a beautiful dark-haired woman (in contrast with the 'English rose' appearance of the narrator) might well have been unconsciously influenced by the air of anti-semitism prevalent in Europe during the 1930s, although Rebecca is also partly based on Jan Ricardo, "a dark-haired, rather exotic young woman, beautiful but highly-strung" (Forster 1993, 91), who was once engaged to Major "Boy" Browning, Daphne du Maurier's husband.

⁴ We owe this point to Clare Hanson.

⁵ "Jan" refers to Jan Ricardo, to whom du Maurier's husband had been briefly engaged before meeting du Maurier; "the Sixpence" was a girl with whom du Maurier believed her husband to be having an affair; "Moper" was her husband's nickname; "my hut" refers to her writing hut, where she wrote her novels.

⁶ Du Maurier had a lifelong interest in the Brontës; not only was her creative writing influenced by both *Jane Eyre* and *Wuthering Heights*, but in 1960 she published a biographical study of the writers' brother entitled *The Infernal World of Branwell Brontë*.

WORKS CITED

- Du Maurier, Daphne. 1975 (1938). *Rebecca*. London: Pan Books Ltd.
- Fleenor, Julian E. (ed.) 1983. *The Female Gothic*. Montreal: Eden Press.
- Forster, Margaret. 1993. *Daphne du Maurier*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Gilbert, Sandra and Susan Gubar. 1984 (1979). *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Johnson, Charles and Linwood Sleight. 1973 (1962). *The Harrap Book of Boys' and Girls' Names*. London: Harrap.
- Light, Alison. 1984. "Returning to Manderley": romance fiction, female sexuality and class". *Feminist Review*. 16.
- 1990 "Returning to Manderley": romance fiction, female sexuality and class". *British Feminist Thought: A Reader*. Ed. Terry Lovell. Oxford: Blackwell. 325-44.
- 1991. *Forever England: Femininity, Literature and Conservatism Between the Wars*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lovell, Terry. 1990. *British Feminist Thought: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Marks, Elaine and Isabelle de Courtivron (eds). 1981. *New French Feminisms*. Brighton: The Harvester Press.
- Massé, Michelle A. 1992. *In the Name of Love: Women, Masochism, and the*

Gothic. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Shallcross, Martyn. 1993 (1991). *The Private World of Daphne du Maurier*. London: Robson Books.

Winterson, Jeanette. 1989. *Sexing the Cherry*. London: Vintage.