Chapter 7
Touching the Surface: Marnie, Melodrama, Modernism

Joe McElhaney

The cinema is necessarily fascination and rape, that is how it acts on people.
Jacques Rivette

What is to be done with Marnie? Of Hitchcock’s major works, it has always been something of a problem child, more sharply dividing the director’s admirers into camps than any of his other films. Released in 1964, it appears at the end of a string of by-now widely acknowledged canonical Hitchcocks: Vertigo (1958), North by Northwest (1959), Psycho (1960) and The Birds (1963). Does Marnie belong in this group or not? Is it the last great Hitchcock film or the first which represents the period of his decline? How is this film to be historically placed within Hitchcock’s body of work?

In an attempt to link Hitchcock’s cinema with ‘the legacy of Victorianism’, Paula Marantz Cohen briefly discusses the degree to which Marnie is an example of an important shift which takes place in Hitchcock’s cinema in the 1960s. In Marnie, Hitchcock is no longer tied to a psychological conception of character so central to a number of his Hollywood films. Instead, he presents the spectator with a world of surface appearances and blatant artificiality in which objects are not related to psychology but ‘to a vocabulary about sex and death that can be manipulated to produce new effects’. Marantz Cohen reads this exploration of a cinema of surfaces in Marnie as a development out of several of Hitchcock’s films of the 1950s in which novelistic and psychological conceptions of ‘depth’ undergo a gradual transformation. In Vertigo, for instance, Madeleine is not so much a character as a ‘vehicle for potential identities’. Vertigo presents us with a ‘surface subjectivity’ in which we find ‘not the world leading into the mysteries of the individual mind but the individual mind opening out into the chaos of the world’. For Marantz Cohen, Marnie takes this tendency towards surface subjectivity to an even higher level. The film does not explore the dialectic of surface/depth in the title character which had been so central in Hitchcock’s treatment of female psychology and sexuality in his earlier American work. With Marnie, there is nothing beneath her surface, ‘no desire to be sparked; the surface coldness speaks the truth’. In this regard, Marnie belongs with the other Hitchcock films of the 1960s in that they ‘fail to evoke more than a fleeting sense of the reality of individual character’.

Why the increased dominance of surface subjectivity and non-psychological conceptions of character in Marnie and Hitchcock’s other 1960s films? And what is the importance of this? Marantz Cohen is not terribly specific aside from touching on cer-
tain cultural shifts of the period and the nature of Hitchcock's own internal developments at this time. While her arguments about surface in the film raise some interesting possibilities, there is something insufficient about them. I cite Marantz Cohen's work here for two reasons: first, it is among the more recent examples of the numerous attempts over the last three decades to define the nature of this difficult film; and second, its emphasis on surface in the film, however problematically argued, is nevertheless central to the film's operation. Consequently, I would like to make use of the spaces left open by her arguments and try to construct a more general framework within which this film may be approached. These spaces are primarily historical, the result of Marnie's troubled relationship to the larger developments of narrative cinema in the early 1960s and Hitchcock's attempts to acknowledge these developments.

If Marnie is the last great Hitchcock film, it does not achieve this status without an enormous process of struggle. Or, to be more precise, the fascination of the film arises out of observing and uncovering this process of struggle itself. While clearly emerging out of various lines of development in Hitchcock's cinema up through the 1960s, the film also seems to be trying to reach a new level of expressivity and meaning for Hitchcock. In particular, this new level relates to Hitchcock's desire to incorporate into the film certain innovations in European art cinema of the early 1960s, directly following experiments begun on The Birds a year earlier. And Marnie does, in fact, have some suggestive parallels with Antonioni's Red Desert, released the same year (although it is unlikely that Hitchcock was able to see this particular Antonioni film before making Marnie). But the incorporation of various aspects of European art cinema into the forms and structures of a Hitchcock thriller produces a certain anxiety on the part of the film which it is not able to resolve.

When The Birds opened in France, Jean-André Fieschi noted that it was the first Hitchcock film 'where the tension isn't aimed at solving a mystery, but at elaborating and developing it' and drew links between The Birds and the recent work of Alain Resnais. But in Marnie, Hitchcock returns to solving a mystery in the manner of a more conventional psychological thriller. Does this immediately result in a 'more conventional film'? There is not a simple response to this. Indeed, the various terms flung at Marnie over the years—character study, Gothic melodrama, art film, avant-garde masterpiece, feminist text, misogynist text, old-fashioned woman's film—bear the traces of the perpetually unresolved tension between the film's ambitions and final achievement. To do justice to Marnie one must account for the film's scattered and diffuse quality. Writing about it must likewise be a form of struggle in which tracing out these various and sometimes irreconcilable ambitions prevents one from being able to ever firmly define the nature of this elusive Hitchcock work.

It is probably best to acknowledge as quickly as possible a certain mythology surrounding the film which has arisen in the aftermath of Donald Spoto's biography of the director. Hitchcock (rather like Scottie Ferguson in Vertigo) allegedly became obsessed with transforming a woman—the film's lead actress, Tippi Hedren—not simply into a star but also into the idealised figure of his romantic dreams. But both the dream of possessing the woman in real life and the dream of transforming the woman into a star collapsed after their personal falling out and the film's critical and financial failure. This financial failure and critical dismissal was not based upon the supposedly modernist strategies of the film but what was perceived to be its old-fashioned nature—its conventional melodramatic scenario with its ties to 'women's fiction' as well as the somewhat archaic look of the film, with its reliance on obvious matte work and rear projections. All of this gave Marnie the aura of a slightly stale Hollywood studio product. With both the production and reception of Marnie, Hitchcock seemed to suffer both a private and public humiliation, one in which his integrity and relevance as a film artist was called into question.

While I would like to avoid any simplistic reading of the film as one in which Hitchcock's personal obsessions with an actress spill over into the formal excesses of the film, this mythology does have a certain degree of interest and usefulness. What it suggests is that Hitchcock's authorial control on Marnie is 'off', unsure of itself and struggling within both the more traditional forms of Hitchcock's cinema and the new forms it is attempting to adapt. This possibly results in the film's resistance to being easily categorised as either modernist or classical. However, in itself this is hardly unusual for a Hitchcock film. As Gilles Deleuze has written of Hitchcock, 'you might equally well say that he's the last of the classic directors, or the first of the moderns.' What is important about Marnie is the intensity with which both these classical and modernist impulses are present. It is as though in its extremity the film serves as a heightened example of this key transitional role which Hitchcock plays within the historical development of cinema.

Although Marantz Cohen does not historically contextualise her arguments about the centrality of surface appearances in Marnie and how these lead to 'new effects', her positioning of Marnie in this way would seem to connect the film with contemporaneous developments in modernist cinema, particularly those of Antonioni. As Sam Rohdie has written on Antonioni's cinema: 'The films will pose a subject (only to compromise it), constitute objects (only to dissolve them), propose stories (only to lose them), but equally, they turn those compromises and losses back towards another solidity... a wandering away from narrative to the surface into which it was dissolved, but in such a way that the surface takes on a fascination, becomes a subject all its own.'

Does this happen in Marnie as well? Do the surfaces ever become a subject of their own? In a way, yes. There is a strong response to surfaces in the film in relation to bodies, faces and objects which, while not without precedent in Hitchcock's work, appear here with a frequency which is unusual. At times, this response creates a powerful desire on the part of the camera to touch these subjects, to get closer and closer, as if to penetrate the essence of what is being filmed and break down a classical system of representation. But this enormous investment in surface intensity also creates a desire on the part of the film to understand and explain what is being shown in ways which are still strongly tied to models derived from classical narrative cinema and, in particular, to psychological conceptions of character.

The production designer on the film, Robert Boyle, has explained the difficulty Hitchcock faced on Marnie: 'Hitchcock was trying to get at something you couldn't see. He was trying to tell a story of things that are not at all overt... He was trying desperately to really dig into the psyche of this woman.' Within this context, discussing Marnie simply as a film of surfaces, in opposition to a psychological cinema, is clearly unacceptable. As Spoto notes, the film has a psychological intimacy to it unusual in
Hitchcock, 'a naked feeling [he] had never allowed in his films before.' At the same time, this knowledge, this 'naked feeling' is also traumatic for the film and causes it to pull back from the full implications of this system. It is this vacillation between surface and psychology, between tactility and knowledge, which dominates the film and seriously complicates attempts to account easily for the nature of the film as a whole.

First let us attempt to situate the film within the nature of Hitchcock's relationship to classical cinema on the one hand and modernist cinema on the other. If Deleuze is correct in historically placing Hitchcock as the last of the great classical film-makers and the first of the modern ones, how does this come about? Deleuze's distinction between classical and modern cinema is well known. The classical cinema of the 'movement-image' which dominates the period prior to World War II is one which strives towards achieving unity between space and movement. In this cinema, time is subordinated to and conquered by movement. The modern cinema of the 'time-image' which comes to dominate after World War II is one in which the 'sensory-motor schema' which defined classical cinema becomes severed. The cinema of the postwar period is no longer classical because movement is defined by its relationship to time, dreams and memory. The protagonists of this cinema no longer enjoy a unity between thought, action and movement as in classical cinema. Instead, they see rather than act, are prey to visions which they cannot control, and consequently often become spectators of their own lives. The emergence of Italian neorealism in the 1940s — of which Antonioni was such a major figure — was central in establishing this new time-image.

Deleuze argues that Hitchcock's 'special place' in between these classical and modern conceptions of the image is the result of Hitchcock's development of the 'mental image.' The mental image insits upon all actions and perceptions being determined by their relation to something else rather than simply existing as autonomous entities within a causal chain of events, as in the classical movement-image. Working out of Charles Peirce's notions of 'thirdness' as central for defining the philosophical tradition of relations, Deleuze argues that it is Hitchcock who introduces relations-through-thirdness into the cinema. There is a 'perpetual tripling' in the structure of Hitchcock's films, with relationships between characters conceived in terms of triangles, with a crucial third partner in the events. Citing Chabrol/Rohmer, he stresses the importance of how crimes in Hitchcock are always being committed in such a way that the criminal 'offers up' her/his crime on behalf of someone else. Marnie and Norman Bates in Psycho do not commit crimes (respectively, theft and murder) on their own behalf — both do it 'for' their mothers, resulting in the crime having a triangular structure: Marnie/Strutt/Mrs Edgar or Norman/Marion/Mrs Bates. This tripling likewise spills over into objects, perceptions, affections, creating a cinematic world in which 'all is interpretation, from beginning to end.' Furthermore, characters in Hitchcock (in a manner which anticipates the protagonists of the time-image) are frequently spectators themselves, caught up in the chain of fascination over the relations being represented along with the viewers of the film.

Deleuze claims that it is not the look as such which defines Hitchcock's cinema but how the look assumes a position within the 'tapestry' of Hitchcock's framing of relations. These relations are mental relations and Hitchcock's primary concern is with the tracing of thought, the mental image representing the most complex realisation of

the cinema's capacity to render thought up to that point in the history of film form. 'It's not a matter of the look,' Deleuze says of the mental image, 'and if the camera's an eye, it's the mind's eye.' For example, when Marnie is first hired at Rutland & Co., she has a brief conversation with another secretary during which the secretary pulls a key out of a purse. This key unlocks a drawer in her desk which contains the safe combination which Marnie wants. Two camera set-ups are employed here through which a sense of the mental image emerges: Marnie's point-of-view shot as we see the secretary's hand reach into the purse, pull out the key and open the drawer, and a slight overhead shot of Marnie looking down.

By cross-cutting between these two set-ups, a dual process of thought tracing emerges, that of Marnie's and that of the spectator observing this. We do not simply look at what Marnie sees through her point-of-view shots by the cross-cutting; this cutting also enables us to observe her thoughts and come to an understanding that the task she is setting for herself is to get her hands on this key in order to read the safe combination in the drawer. At the same time, our own perceptions as spectators are being directly solicited here. The overhead shot of Marnie has a strong authorial feel to it, of something deliberately placed there in order for us to notice it as a shot, as a camera set-up. This is not a mere stylistic flourish but an announcement to the spectator: this is a woman thinking. Furthermore, in the camera set-up which shows the hands of the secretary reaching for her key, the movements of her hands with the key have a slightly artificial quality to them, as she pauses first with the key coming out of her purse and then when she opens the drawer. Both gestures are held an 'unnaturally' long time in terms of realist convention. But this extension of time also enables the spectator to read more easily the images and grasp what is going on inside Marnie's mind. These protracted gestures of the secretary's are there for our benefit and not Marnie's. They seem to be addressing us and not her. As Godard has noted, Hitchcock creates films in which the spectator does not simply look at the film, the film also looks back at the spectator.

The task of implicating and involving the spectator in a set of relations at the same time that the characters metaphorically become spectators results in a conception of the image which repeatedly seems to be examining its own operations, not simply classical narrative films but also films which are about the process of classical narrative cinema.

In this regard, Hitchcock anticipates many of the concerns of the postwar modern cinema of the time-image. The French new wave (all of whom were committed to Hitchcock's work) were likewise concerned with the implications of the mental image. But they were committed to it in order to construct a definite break with the classical movement-image, severing the mental image's ties to action or character: 'What Hitchcock had wanted to avoid, a crisis of the traditional action-image, would nevertheless happen in his wake, and in part as a result of his innovations.' However, there is also something else going on here. I referred to the hand movements of the secretary as being held an unnaturally long time and ascribed these entirely to their narrative function and to their relationship to the mental image. I am struck, however, by the poised, almost ritualistic quality to these hand movements and to the fetishistic impact of the opening of the leather purse and the tiny key held in the secretary's hand. These shots seem to be a bit overdetermined, exerting a tactile fascination which slightly oversteps their function within the narrative. Rather than observing a
simple action here, we seem to be in a world in which these actions are transformed into, as Deleuze phrases it, 'symbolic acts that have a purely mental existence.' Granted, Hitchcock's cinema is full of such moments as this one in *Marnie*. As a technical and stylistic tour de force, this sequence would seem to be rather minor in comparison with that other great key shot in Hitchcock, the elaborate craning movement in *Notorious* (1946) from the top of the stairs of Alex Sebastian's home down to Alicia's closed hand, holding the key to the wine cellar. But the impact of this moment in *Marnie* derives not simply from the execution of the sequence itself as from how it fits within the film's larger structure of meaning. And it is this structure of meaning which is central in the film's struggle to bring forth a different kind of Hitchcock film.

The close-up modifies the drama by the impact of proximity. Pain is within reach. If I stretch out my arm I touch you, and that is intimacy. I can count the eye-lashes of this suffering. I would be able to taste the tears. Never before has a face turned to mine in that way. Ever closer it presses against me, and I follow it face to face. It's not even true that there is air between us; I consume it. It is in me like a sacrament. Maximum visual acuity.

Jean Epstein

Deleuze refers to a tactile cinema which emerges out of the collapse of the classical movement—image. In this cinema, the hand relinquishes its prehensile and motor functions to content itself with pure touching. The ultimate example of this cinema for Deleuze (and he does not mention Hitchcock at all here) is Robert Bresson's, in which the hand often replaces the face in terms of affects and becomes a mode of perception itself. In this cinema of tactility, the optical function is doubled through the hand's newly discovered powers of perception. The hand itself now becomes a kind of eye. *Marnie* is not *Pickpocket* (1959). Unlike Bresson's film, it does not systematically and structurally orchestrate the relationship between the hand and the eye, between seeing and touching. But this tactility is nevertheless there in the film, imbedded within its narrative and psychological conflicts. *Marnie* demonstrates a desire to break through certain classical narrative conventions and to enter a realm of 'pure touching' in which the hand both feels and sees.

In the midst of a montage sequence on board the honeymoon cruise ship in *Marnie*, Mark Rutland describes to Marnie an object in Africa which, to the naked eye, appears to be a flower. It is not until one reaches out and touches this object that one is able to perceive that the flower is in fact a conglomeration of tiny insects gathered together in the shape of a flower as a form of protection from the forces of nature. This brief monologue (almost tossed away by the film) is nevertheless crucial for understanding the relationship between touching and looking which structures much of *Marnie*. The desire to touch another human being who does not want to be touched animates the system of looking and perceiving which always determined Hitchcock's cinema. But here this system is taken to another level in the manner in which it is integrated within the narrative and thematic content of the film. In *Marnie*, the relationship of the look—that of the camera, of the characters, of the spectators—to desire has seldom been as intense as it is here because it now introduces touch, the presence of a hand against an object, another human being, an animal (and Marnie's physical response to her horse,

Forio, is far more intimate and sexual than with any human being in the film) as the culmination of the chain of desire and of the process of perception.

Central here is a sequence which takes place about ten minutes into the film. In this sequence Marnie and her mother, Mrs Edgar, have a conversation in Mrs Edgar's kitchen. This conversation centres around the possibility of Mrs Edgar's neighbours, Mrs Cotton and her young daughter Jessie (a rival for Marnie's affections for her mother), moving in. The sequence is brief but powerful. Before discussing its importance and effectiveness within the context of the film as a whole it is necessary to describe it in some detail.

As the sequence begins, it is initially composed of a rather mundane medium two-shot of the women, followed by a frontal medium close-up of Marnie as she cracks pecans sitting at the table, alternating with two medium close-ups of her mother (one from her front, the other from her side) standing as she pours syrup. Mrs Edgar detects Marnie's jealousy of Jessie and begins to chide her for it. This emotional rupture results in the editing configuration suddenly being broken as the camera position on Marnie shifts from the front to her side and moves in closer as she looks up at her mother and asks, 'Why don't you love me, Mama? I've often wondered why you don't. Why you never give me one part of the love you give Jessie.' We now return to the shot of her mother taken from the side but she now appears rather vulnerable in the shot, standing at the far right of the composition, unable to answer Marnie's question, in opposition to her daughter who sits centre frame. Mrs Edgar moves towards a salt shaker on the table and there is a cut to a close-up of Marnie's hand touching her mother's and uttering the word, 'Mama.' Mrs Edgar pulls her hand away as the camera pans up to her horrified face. A cut returns us to a medium two-shot as Marnie asks, 'Why do you always move away from me. Why? What's wrong with me?' 'Nothing,' the mother says, 'there's nothing wrong with you.' 'No, you've always thought that, haven't you! Always.' A cut returns us to the centred close-up of Marnie looking at her mother as she continues accusing her mother of not loving her, detailing all the things she has done to make her mother love her. But this time the close-up on Marnie is an almost imperceptibly slow tracking shot into her, while the reverse shots of her mother which periodically interrupt those of Marnie's outburst, are still taken from the same slightly off-centre position. Marnie's accusations build in intensity until Mrs Edgar's hand enters the space of Marnie's close-up, slapping her. This is followed by a cut to Marnie's hand hitting the bowl of pecans, knocking them to the floor.

It is difficult to describe on paper the emotional quality of this scene. In the rigour of construction and emphasis on looking it is recognisably Hitchcockian. But it has an emotional intensity of a particular kind which is rare in this director's work. (The final sequence of the film, also set in Mrs Edgar's home, has a similar quality.) The centred close-ups of Marnie accusing her mother of insufficiently loving her just slightly avoid being direct addresses into the camera. Nevertheless, there is (to borrow a phrase from Spoto) a naked emotional feeling at work here, so naked that, like Mrs Edgar, one feels the impulse to recoil from what we are witnessing. Marnie is centred in the composition and is on the offensive but is seated and seems diminished in the shot; Mrs Edgar is standing but is shoved to the far right of the shot, finding it difficult to move. The close-up of the two women's hands touching breaks this particular tension but creates another...
more acute one, establishing the problematic of touch as a motif which will recur throughout the film, a touch which can only be expressed in an indirect fashion. Mrs Edgar cannot touch her daughter's hand as an expression of love but she can use the same hand to slap Marnie's face, as Marnie's hand simultaneously hits the bowl of pecans intended for a pie for Jessie.

Perhaps the shot which contains the greatest emotional volatility and potential violence here is the close-up of Marnie's hand touching her mother's. In this sequence so strongly built around close-ups of the faces of the two women and in which the activities of their hands are devoted to banal and mechanical domestic duties (cracking pecans, pouring syrup), this close-up carries such an emotional weight because the hands are now suddenly being called upon to express a function, stopping the action, so to speak. This expressive function is something that Mrs Edgar refuses, and she must give her hand a more precise function, slapping the accusing face of her daughter, restoring both the hand and the face to their 'proper' functions. What this sequence makes clear is that Marnie's projection of herself in the world outside of her mother's home, as an unavailable object of desire, is an unconscious response to this situation with her mother. Since her mother will not touch her, will not love her, then she will move in a world in which no one – particularly no man – will be able to touch her. Out of this arises Marnie's (and the film's) drive towards a world of surfaces, a drive which is nevertheless intimately related to the need to unmask surfaces, to touch what is beneath the seductive and remote exterior.

But does this sequence lend itself to a reading which would claim it for a modernist cinema of tactility? In spite of the emphasis on touching here and the almost Bressonian power of the close-up of Marnie's hand reaching out to her mother's, probably not. The sequence has a hysterical theatricality, the feeling of something carefully written and performed, which links it strongly with the world of melodrama. Melodrama was vital to the formation of Hitchcock's cinema. His pursuit of 'pure cinema' found in the genres of melodrama a set of codes, iconographies, narrative structures, character types, through which his particular concerns with exploring the formal possibilities of cinema could be articulated. In the espionage and detective thriller, the Gothic woman-centred melodrama and the horror film, there is a fascination with looking and voyeurism, with complex and shifting issues of point of view and focalisation, a fascination which Hitchcock was able to integrate into the broader concerns of his cinema of mental relations. Nevertheless, the melodramatic tone of this sequence from Marnie is still rare for Hitchcock.

Peter Brooks has written of melodrama that it 'handles its feelings and ideas virtually as plastic entities, visual and tactile models held out for all to see and handle'. Recall the famous scene in Hitchcock's Gothic melodrama Rebecca (1940) in which Mrs Danvers takes the heroine on a tour of Rebecca's closets, inviting her to insert her hand under the folds of Rebecca's lingerie and rub her face against the sleeve of a fur coat. Marnie's concern with tactility, then, is perhaps as much a late development out of a particular tradition of melodrama as it is a response to European art cinema. But in Marnie, instead of simply filming and representing this desire for tactility – as in Rebecca – Hitchcock is intent upon his entire film-making apparatus being called upon to stimulate this desire. Melodrama in Marnie is made use of and then passed through, as it were, the form's logic of tactility pushed to such a degree that genre conventions are almost beside the point. As Raymond Durgnat has written, often in this film 'the melodrama is merely a symbol, a symptom, a mask'.

The most extreme and violent instance of touch within the film occurs almost immediately after Mark's description of the African insects: the rape scene. This rape scene was vital to Hitchcock's conception of the film. It had to be there. Marnie's original screenwriter, Evan Hunter, refused to write the sequence, finding it unmotivated and fearing that Mark would completely lose audience sympathy as a result. Hunter was replaced by Jay Presson Allen. One of the interesting things about this sequence, however, is that Mark does not seem to lose this audience sympathy. (Robin Wood rhapsodises over the rape as 'one of the purest treatments of sexual intercourse the cinema has given us'.) Various reasons for this come to mind: the star persona of Sean Connery is so completely bound up with him as a charismatic romantic and sexual figure that Marnie's refusal to have sex with him threatens to render her in somewhat unsympathetic terms (what 'normal' heterosexual woman would not want to sleep with James Bond?); and after the rape, the film very quickly works to restore Mark to his place as a romantic male protagonist, substitute psychotherapist for Marnie, and detective figure for the unravelling of the central narrative enigma. Furthermore, it is hardly unprecedented in melodrama for an ostensibly sympathetic male figure to rape a woman, provided the woman is his wife and that she, within the logic of the film, 'deserves' this violent act performed against her: Gone with the Wind (1939) and The Foxes of Harrow (1947) are two examples of Hollywood films in which the hero feels compelled to rape the sexually recalcitrant heroine/wife. But even more crucial than these reasons, I think, are those which relate back to both how this rape scene functions within the film's structure of touch, as well as how the sequence itself is formally organised.

According to Raymond Bellour, Hitchcock's authorial presence in Marnie (and elsewhere in his work) is largely connected with power. Mark and Strutt are 'nothing but doubles' of Hitchcock, 'the first among all his doubles, a matrix which allows their generation'. This desire for power as expressed through the camera – particularly in relation to the looks directed towards Marnie by Mark, Strutt and Hitchcock in his cameo appearance – is unquestionably there, as Bellour argues. In fact, Hitchcock's desire to articulate this relation between power and desire in Marnie is unusually forceful. But I would argue that there is no other Hitchcock film in which the camera's look directed towards the desirable female protagonist is less mediated through the look of a strong, desiring male protagonist. In spite of Bellour's contention that in the opening moments of Marnie, Strutt and Mark function as doubles for Hitchcock (and if Strutt is a double for Hitchcock he is a most unpleasant one), the overwhelming impression generated by these moments is that of Marnie being presented to us and to the camera largely free of a strong male character as a secondary figure in terms of the look. The looks directed towards Marnie by Strutt and Mark are continually being superseded by Hitchcock's camera. While these men may look at Marnie – and Mark is given a number of point-of-view shots of her later in the film – Hitchcock continually reserves the greatest moments of intensity for looking at Marnie for his own camera, divorced from or strongly intervening in the look generated by the male characters.
In the first sequence of the film in which we see Mark and Strutt, the look which the two men possess is wholly an operation of the mind in relation to memory: Strutt's fetishistic inventory of her features, Mark's reduction of her to 'the brunet with the legs'. In his cameo, Hitchcock looks briefly at Marnie as she passes through the hall, reserving the first look at her within the diegetic world of the film for himself, suggesting a privileging of his and the camera's look over the other male characters. Indeed, throughout this opening as we see Marnie on the train platform, in the hotel room as she unpacks and exchanges identities, rousing the black dye out of her hair, etc., we are being brought into spaces for looking at Marnie which are denied Mark or Strutt (even if their descriptions prepare us for it), highly private spaces in which the texture of objects—the yellow leather purse, the tweed suit, the jet-black hair, the pink nail polish, the gold metal case holding her plastic identity cards—are clearly meant to serve as displaced extensions of Marnie's body and in which our eyes are invited to metaphorically touch these objects. In the second sequence of the film, as Strutt recites his inventory of Marnie's features to the detectives, he looks off into space and gestures with his hands, as though somehow language, sight and memory are inadequate for the full articulation of his desire for Marnie; he must somehow ritualistically re-enact the gesture of touch which he was never able to realise when she was under his employ. All of this sets up a powerful environment in which the look generates the desire for touch, to get even closer to the object of desire. But this look in itself is also determined by an indecisiveness, moments of possession of Marnie by the camera alternating with moments in which that look by the camera is broken off: it pulls back, it looks away (the pan away from Marnie's face during the rape scene to a porthole, for example), it delegates the look to someone else, as though it realises it cannot go any further or get any closer.

The opening shot of the film encapsulates this position for the camera in Marnie: an extremely close shot of a yellow purse, tightly held in Marnie's arm against a green tweed jacket, the camera moving along behind her, the two movements at one, until she picks up speed and the camera reedes until she is further away on the platform and the camera sees her in long shot, remote and unapproachable. Pascal Bonitzer has described the movement from further away to close up as Hitchcock's most characteristic device, a passage from the large picture to the small, from environment to object.27 However, we often get the reverse of this in Marnie: the camera now immediately wants to be as close as possible, to get inside the woman both physically (to touch, to penetrate) and mentally, to convey her psychological state, that something which cannot be seen. The role of enunciator (as Bellour calls it) that Hitchcock traditionally reserves for himself is threatened by this reversed conception of movement in that this role was always predicated on a slight and ironic distance from the chain of desire which he sets into motion as the enunciator. Now Hitchcock's camera seems even more caught up in the chain of desire than his characters, more than Mark (too insufficiently realised as a character) or Strutt (too unsympathetic, too much of a heavy to generate spectator identification).

The most important character in possession of the look in the film is not Mark but Marnie. But this creates a problem for the film. Stojan Pehlo has referred to 'the long chain of Hitchcock's female characters who persistently oscillate between presence and absence'. Pehlo writes: 'Each and every one of them owes her status of simulacrum to the very cinematographic disposition that is capable, with a single stroke, of replacing presence with absence...'. This female character is both object of the look and bearer of it. As bearer of the look she may even possess this look to an intense degree and be subject to visions, a look at once acute (in that she sees more deeply into the abyss than the male characters often do) and myopic (in that this also limits her ability to see relations, the larger picture of things). It is this space for seeing relations (the Deleuzian notion of thirdness) which is reserved for the spectator and for Hitchcock as authorising agent. In Marnie, on the other hand, the acuteness of the heroine's vision is too internalised. She 'sees' in her red flashes and her recurring nightmares but does not know, does not understand, nor do we—until the end—as spectators. She is not drawn by her visions but subject to them. They become problems to be deciphered. So that when her vision is at its most acute, it does not take us closer into the heart of relations which make up the film but instead becomes an enigma, something which freezes the chain of relations.

There is a split in the film between these moments of vision Marnie has and the more mundane tracing of her thoughts through the point-of-view shot, most often centring around the theft of money and changing of identities. These point-of-view shots are rather banal in their intensity in comparison to what is clearly troubling Marnie. Marnie's looks in the film raise two separate questions in relation to the narrative. The first and most urgent of these is: What is wrong with Marnie?—a question which the film delays in answering. The other—Will she get caught stealing the money?—more directly animates the film and creates narrative suspense. But it is clear that Marnie's stealing is a symptom of something, the source of which she does not know or understand, so that Marnie's look and her activities which animate the narrative (and supply her with goals in the tradition of characters in classical narratives) are nevertheless contaminated with her enigmatic visions. In other words, both of these looks, which are at the centre of Marnie's operation, intensify the sense of displacement which runs throughout the film and to the sense that Hitchcock is attempting to render visible what is, in cinematic terms, invisible. This something which can't be seen is a mind which records and observes but does not understand and does not even primarily wish to understand, but merely to act upon a set of unconscious desires. The operation of the mental image, so vital to the pleasure of Hitchcock's cinema, is present in a 'neurotic' state here. The pleasures to be had by observing mental processes is secondary in Marnie to the recording of a mental state which is blocked, unable to process. As a result, vision itself here often becomes a kind of surface in its own right, as in the red flashes which fill the screen whenever Marnie sees the color red or the crude backwards and forwards zooms when she tries to steal money from the Rutland safe after the death of Forio, devices which simultaneously seem to bring the image closer to us and push it away.29

Throughout the film, however, there is a powerful need for Hitchcock's camera to possess Marnie, to offer her up as something which cannot only be viewed but physically touched as well. This provides the spectator with a strong sense of intimacy in relation to the character, but it is an intimacy tinged with a certain amount of discomfort or embarrassment in that the relationship with the protagonist is inevitably an imaginary one. We are being pulled into a network of desire which we know, on some level, to be impossible. Hitchcock's cinema is replete with moments in which the camera cannot seem to get close enough to what it is filming, particularly if it is filming a
woman. Two examples from the opposite ends of death and desire in this fixation with proximity: the opening shot of the first ‘true’ Hitchcock film, The Lodger (1926), in which the face of a woman in the process of being murdered is placed almost directly on the lens of the camera; and the first shot of Lisa Fremont in Rear Window (1954), slowly and seductively moving into the camera as though to make love to it.

However in Marnie, through a combination of the repetition of these kinds of examples and the way in which tactility emerges as a thematic thread, this emphasis on proximity and touch becomes a governing principle of the film. During the first kiss between Mark and Marnie in his office during the thunderstorm, the camera comes in to a close two-shot of the couple and then, as if to confound all expectations, the camera executes an even tighter slow zoom into them, obliterating everything but eyes, noses and mouths. This close-up has obvious correspondences with the love scene in The Lodger, with the extended kiss in Notorious (1946), and the first kiss between L. B. Jeffries and Lisa in Rear Window. But in an even more extreme way in this sequence from Marnie, Hitchcock’s camera is almost refusing to acknowledge boundaries between the actors, the camera and the spectator. These tactile-like images in which flesh seems to cover the frame are not so much returning a look to the spectator as they are returning a touch, the faces almost seeming to brush against the camera and across the imagination of the viewer.30

In spite of such volatile moments as the kiss and the rape, Hitchcock was unhappy with the film’s failure to adequately define Mark Rutland as a character. In particular, he was disappointed with the film’s inadequacy in documenting that the fundamental nature of Mark’s obsession with Marnie had to do with a fetish – an attraction to a woman because she is a criminal. Indeed, throughout the film, Mark’s desires for Marnie, and his declaration of love for her as they are driving on the highway, are somewhat hazily defined and motivated, quite the opposite of the treatment of Scottie’s attraction for Madeleine in Vertigo, which is very precisely articulated. But one could argue that this does not really matter because Hitchcock’s camera is the primary desiring subject in Marnie and has, in effect, replaced the male protagonist who is now reduced to being a kind of supporting player. It is not Mark alone who is penetrating Marnie during the rape scene. This sequence acquires its force not simply from the dramatic event itself but by the specific cinematic properties at work here. As Marnie is lowered onto the bed, the camera position suggests not only Mark’s point of view as he brings himself toward her body, but the camera here also appears to be attempting to penetrate Marnie. This, of course, it ultimately cannot do. It must pan away to the visual metaphor of the porthole before actually making physical contact with her.

Chris Marker has written that the 360-degree tracking shot in the hotel room in Vertigo (‘the most magical camera movement in the history of cinema’) should be seen as a substitute for the moment of sexual union between Scottie and Judy which Hitchcock, for reasons of censorship, cannot show.31 By the time of Marnie, this language of metaphor is increasingly inadequate for Hitchcock. He must get even closer and the camera must begin to assume a more literal function. In this regard, the rape scene from Marnie stands somewhere in between the Vertigo tracking shot and the strangulation and rape scene in Frenzy (1972). In the rape and murder sequence from Frenzy, all attempts at seduction of the viewer are gone. No spectacular camera movements, no luxurious lighting, no glamorous movie stars. We are in a drab, straightforward universe in which all touch is violence (significantly here, murder by strangulation), all sex is rape, and human beings are reduced to a set of animal-like instincts and behaviour. (The film’s repeated insistence on the linking of food, sex and human beings is expressed here by the rape and murder taking place in the midst of the woman’s lunch break, with the murderer finishing his victim’s half-eaten apple after killing her.) This sequence from Frenzy may be read as, in some ways, a negative and bitter response to the rape sequence in Marnie. What began as a gradual breakdown of the cinematic language of metaphor in the 1964 film in favour of a cinema which points towards the affective possibilities of touch are violently forsaken, in the 1972 film, in favour of a crushing and nihilistic literal-mindedness.

This rapist/murderer from Frenzy (why recall the character’s name?) is far removed from Mark Rutland in terms of sympathy. To return, then, to the rape sequence from Marnie, another possible reason why Mark does not seem to lose audience sympathy after the rape relates to the question of thirst so central to Hitchcock. Mark is not a mere aggressor in his relationship with Marnie during the rape. His relationship with her duplicates Marnie’s relationship with her mother, with Mark assuming Marnie’s role and Marnie assuming her mother’s. He is not simply Marnie’s antagonist nor her romantic opposite, but a kind of double of her in relation to the film’s motif of touch and desire: Mark wants to touch Marnie who wants to touch her mother.

There are, however, two characters in the film who represent the final points of this chain of touch and desire, characters at the opposite ends of Marnie’s two families, her biological family and the one she marries into. First, there is Mark’s sister-in-law Lil who creates a crucial third element in the chain of desire in the Mark/Marnie marriage: Lil desires Mark and touches him – aggressively kissing him on the mouth as he departs for his honeymoon – but cannot possess him sexually. When Marnie is brought to the Rutland estate for the first time, Lil even pretends that her wrist is sprained, preventing her from pouring the tea and forcing Marnie to do it instead – an act of subterfuge which allows her to more boldly take Marnie in with her eyes. Lil’s look throughout the film has the potential for powers of acuteness, something which Marnie seems to instinctively realise. At their first meeting in the film, in the Rutland office, Lil’s point-of-view shot as she looks at Marnie is one in which Marnie’s head turns away, refusing to make eye contact with her, a gesture she repeats throughout the film. Lil’s look at Marnie is one connected to pure knowledge unrelated to sexual desire – a desire for Marnie, at any rate – and is motivated by the need to unmask Marnie, to reveal the truth under the surface appearance of her rival for Mark’s affections. This is what Marnie seems to instinctively realise about Lil. She avoids her glance because it is not one that she has any power over. Lil immediately understands where the source of Marnie’s power comes from – her appearance. (Her first question to Mark after meeting Marnie: ‘Who’s the dish?’) But Lil’s potential function in regard to uncovering the truth behind Marnie’s appearance is never systematically followed through in the film. Instead, she uncovers information about which we are already familiar: Marnie’s relationship with Strutt, the fact that Marnie has a mother in Baltimore.

Second, there is Mrs Edgar who freely touches Jessie, the child who becomes the third party in relation to the chain of desire within the space of Mrs Edgar’s home. But even
more crucial here is Mrs Edgar's former profession – prostitute, a woman who, as Mark phrases it near the end of the film, 'makes her living from the touch of men'. The central narrative enigmas of the film (Why does Marnie steal? Why is she sexually unresponsive? And what does her past life with her mother have to do with this?) are derived from this world of her childhood in which 'the touch of men' was a central fact of her life with her mother: significantly, a recurring enigmatic image in Marnie's nightmares as an adult is of a disembodied man's hand knocking against a window pane. It is the touch of someone other than her mother – the sailor who puts his hands on the young Marnie when she is having a nightmare – which traumatizes her and leads to the confused hysteria and murder of the sailor with a poker by Marnie's own hands which sets into motion the central psychological conflicts of the film.

But however thematically valid this resolution is in terms of the motif of touch, it also raises another problem in terms of reading the film too easily as belonging to a modernist cinema of tactility. The resolution to Marnie is one which explains the source of Marnie's neurosis in terms of a repressed traumatic childhood memory. There is an attempt to tie up loose ends and provide a tentative hope for a possible cure for Marnie. This resolution may contain its own internal contradictions and ambivalences; and the final moments of the film have a vague tapering-off effect rather than a sense of a firm conclusion. But the need for this more traditional melodramatic resolution in which appearances are uncovered and explanations offered is still present. This more traditional resolution would seem to mark a regression, a movement away from the art-cinema-influenced ambiguous ending of The Birds the year before. Fassbinder has commented on this ending: 'I just couldn't make a film like Hitchcock's Marnie as Marnie is told, because I don't have the courage for such naiveté, simply to make such a film and then at the end to give such an explanation. I don't have that something which is a natural part of courage, but maybe some day I will have it, and then I'll be just like Hollywood.' Fassbinder's own melodramas of the 1970s, produced within a firmly alternative film-making practice, consistently resist the kind of 'happy ending' which Hitchcock imposes on himself here. However much Hitchcock's work anticipates and then overlaps with the modern cinema of the postwar period through his development of the mental image, a film like Marnie makes it clear that his manner of thinking as a film-maker is still deeply entrenched in the pre-war period's conception of (as Deleuze puts it) 'the ideal of knowledge as harmonious totality, which sustains this classical representation'. Hitchcock's desire for possession and control of his camera reaches a peak of intensity in Marnie. But it is also a possession bound up with loss – loss of the female star, loss of public interest in his latest work and, most damaging of all for Hitchcock, loss of a firm sense of control over the final result.

In Red Desert (which David Bordwell has termed an 'ant lyrical melodrama' Antinioni, like Hitchcock, presents us with a heroine, Guilliana (Monica Vitti), who is mentally disturbed. Like Marnie, the experience with colours is often troubling for her and they become a sign of her mental instability. Also like Marnie, Guilliana is both strongly drawn to (and sometimes recoils from) the sense of touch. The film partly explains that Guilliana's mental condition was activated by a car accident but it is also clear that her problems run much deeper than that. What they are precisely is something which the film never attempts to locate, at least not within the conventional terms of melodrama to which Marnie is indebted. But like Marnie, the film holds out a tentative possibility at the end that the heroine will cope, will survive her mental ordeal. There is a moment early in the film when Giuliana is standing on the street and a newspaper drifts down from somewhere above her. As it begins to reach the ground, she holds it down with her foot and we observe the oddly fascinating sight of Monica Vitti's high-heeled shoe pressed against this newspaper before she lets it go. Rohdie writes of this sequence: 'For a moment, the narrative is halted as the paper descends along the wall bringing forward in its movement the sense of that movement itself, the effect of it on the colour and texture of the wall, the feel of the air, and then the narrative continues ...'

There is a similar moment in Marnie, after she checks an old suitcase, which contains the objects of her identity as Marion Holland, into a locker at a bus station. She takes the key over to a heating vent and drops it through, which we see in close-up, the tip of her high-heeled shoe delicately shoving the key down the vent until it disappears: four shots alternating between Marnie moving across the station floor, her gloved hand holding the key, her point-of-view shot of the vent and finally the key being dropped down. In Red Desert, we have a moment in which the narrative (such as it is) is suspended in favour of a moment of purely formal contemplation; in Marnie, we have a moment which serves a narrative function but which, in the organisation of shots, carries a fascination which cannot simply be reduced to that narrative function. These shots in Marnie are both classically economical in the narrative information they convey but also overdetermined in their fetishistic response to details – the gloved hand, the key, the high-heeled shoe – and in the fragmentation of Marnie's body in this brief journey from the locker to the vent. (In one of Godard's recent episodes of Histoire du cinema, he extracts this shot of Marnie's shoe with the key out of its narrative context, slows it down and freezes it, allowing the latent abstraction of this moment to come forward.)

At moments such as these, Hitchcock and the European art cinema of the period come face to face. But Hitchcock must finally explain in a way that Antonioni does not. The abstraction of the moment involving the newspaper is part of a much larger system at work in Red Desert of exploring the elusive relationship between narrative and form, between surfaces and what may potentially lie beneath them. In Antonioni, stories, motivations, psychology, are ultimately swallowed up by the space and form of the film itself. Hitchcock's cinema implies such a possibility. But most of his films must come back around to narrativising and explaining. The reasons for these differences are complex, the result of a network of historical and cultural forces which have gone into making Hitchcock and Antonioni the kinds of film-makers they are. Fundamental, in the case of Hitchcock, are his ties to classical narrative cinema, to Hollywood and to the logic of melodrama, which always insists upon the need to explain and provide meaning, to reinforce and underline, to offer abundance rather than absence, a world in which surfaces must finally reveal. But in Marnie these revelations, while present, no longer seem completely adequate to the issues which the film has raised. It is almost as though this tactile world being offered up to us acquires such a fascination that no narrative explanation can possibly locate that fascination.

Durgan has written that Antonioni and Hitchcock are 'like two rivers arising from the same range of mountains'. Antonioni leads us to 'the enigmas of experience' and
away from 'the chatter of false explanation', while Hitchcock 'conjures up our nightmares only to shunt our minds into complacencies of conformism and unreality'. This isn't quite right either, but it is indicative of a certain attitude towards the supposed inadequacies of Hitchcock's cinema during the period in which his later films were produced. (Dungate's book on the director, excerpts of which began appearing in the late 1960s, was published in 1974.) This inadequacy towards his film-making practice was something which Hitchcock himself felt acutely. Two years after making Marnie, he saw Blow-Up. His response to the writer Howard Fast: 'My God, Howard! I've just seen Antonioni's Blow-Up (1966). These Italian directors are a century ahead of me in terms of technique! What have I been doing all this time?'" Hitchcock feels the pull, the attraction of this new conception of the image which he sees in the work of Antonioni and others, is aware of this development and is no doubt fascinated by it as he must clearly recognise some relationship to his own work. He wants to claim some part of this cinema for himself, not simply because it is fashionable but because he is entitled to do so. But he remains a film-maker perpetually on the dividing line between the pre-war classical cinema and the postwar modernist cinema in spite of himself.

All of this touching in Marnie, all these hands grasping at something — perhaps just the symptom of a man fascinated by a beautiful but unattainable actress. But why not also read those hands as reaching out towards something else — the postwar art cinema, a world equally unattainable to Hitchcock and which fascinates him even more?
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