HOW WOMEN ARE PORTRAYED IN THE ROMANTIC COMEDIES *PILLOW TALK* (1959) AND *WHEN HARRY MET SALLY* (1989)

A dissertation submitted to the Caspersen School of Graduate Studies

Drew University in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree,

Doctor of Letters

Helena Ann Swanicke

Drew University

Madison, New Jersey

May 2016

ABSTRACT

How Women are Portrayed in the Romantic Comedies
Pillow Talk 1959 and *When Harry Met Sally* 1989

Doctor of Letters Dissertation by

Helena A. Swanicke

The Caspersen School of Graduate Studies
Drew University May 2016

This study examines how women are portrayed in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally,* two iconic romantic comedies from different time periods, 1959 and 1989, respectively. The analysis relies primarily on three film scholars, Tamar Jeffers McDonald, Mark Rubinfeld, and Hilary Radner. With the sex comedy *Pillow Talk* and the neo-traditional comedy *When Harry Met Sally* highlighting different time periods, and reflecting a society's desires, anxieties, and assumptions, these different romantic comedy subgenres deliver male and female gazes, which lead us on a historical journey. The romantic story is comically entertaining, while supporting traditional gender roles, family values, and a patriarchal ideology. Through an examination of the narrative elements, an overriding theme emerges in both time periods; females are seeking fulfillment through marriage. Contributing factors in both plots are race, social class, work, friendship, male/female communication, intimacy, and sexual mores. This work creates a paradigm for analyzing other romantic comedies and genres of film in order to understand what they say about social values.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wonderful husband, Paul Swanicke, who has been there from the start supporting my academic endeavors and to my parents, Alex and Agnes Gwiazdowski, who taught me at a young age to love learning and realize its personal and spiritual empowerment.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my scholarly readers, Dr. Laura Winters and Dr. Liana Piehler, for their excellent guidance through the research process, and their caring, and patience over the course of this study. I feel blessed to have had both professors for courses, which enriched me intellectually and personally, and I am grateful that they are my defense committee.

I would like to thank Dr. Shirley Russak Wachtel, who as a close friend and colleague, was always willing to listen, read, and give suggestions as I worked my way through the study with her moral support.

I would like to thank my husband for his moral support and encouragement and my daughters, Elizabeth Swanicke Loonam and Stephanie Swanicke Slater, who have patiently endured hearing about this study.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It is the conversation between a man and a woman that defines their character in movies. In *Pillow Talk,* what is Jan Morrow learning about Brad Allen when he tells her, "Don't tell me this young fellow was trying to force his attentions on you. There is one thing I can't stand—a man that tries to take advantage of a woman. We make short work of this kind back in Texas I can tell ya?" In *When Harry Met Sally,* what is Sally Albright learning about Harry Burns when he tells her, "Had my dream again. Where I was making love and the Olympic judges are watching. I nailed the compulsories. This is it. The finals. I got a nine from the Canadians. A perfect ten from the Americans. . .?"

The conversation between Brad and Jan and Harry and Sally are telling of the time period and a popular movie genre in 1959 and 1989, respectively. Doris Day as Jan, Rock Hudson as Brad, Meg Ryan as Sally, and Billy Crystal as Harry were megastars, and audiences loved their romantic comedies. With *Pillow Talk*, Universal Studios grossed $15 million in 1959, which in 2012 dollars would be $117 million (Wasko 145). As two of Universal's biggest moneymakers, Doris Day and Rock Hudson continued being megastars in *A Touch of Mink* (1962), *Send Me No Flowers* (1964), and *Move Over, Darling* (1963).

The generation intrigued with Day's romantic comedies were the Traditionalists, those born from 1922 to 1945. The popularity of Day's films seem to be telling of the way Traditionalist women expressed themselves in society—hard, dedicated workers, loyal, and trusting of the "chain in command" (Thielfold and Scheef). On the other hand, Meg Ryan's popular romantic comedies are: *When Harry Met Sally* (1989), *Sleepless in*

Seattle (1993), *French Kiss* (1995), and *You've Got Mail* (1998). Similar to *Pillow Talk, When Harry Met Sally* was a huge box office hit, grossing $100 million in 1989 (Morton 67). The generation captivated by Ryan's romantic comedies was the Baby Boomers, those born from 1946-1964. The popularity of these films may have something to do with the way Boomer women expressed themselves in society—team workers and a driven work ethic (Thielfold and Scheef).

This study will explore how women are portrayed in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally,* two iconic romantic comedies from different time periods, 1959 and 1989, respectively. The analysis relies primarily on three film scholars, Tamar Jeffers McDonald, Mark Rubinfeld, and Hilary Radner. Their scholarly insights, and those of other film critics have been instrumental in showcasing the similarities and differences among the women portrayed in these love stories. The women in both films share a similar desire, which is self-fulfillment through marriage while reflecting the social structure of their time period. Under consideration are audience expectations, the female characters' influence on the female and male audience, the changes to the Hollywood system, the directors' and screenwriters' control of the romantic goals of the female characters, the effects of the narrative elements—character, setting, plot, themes, tone, mood, and point of view to reach the resolution.

To compare and contrast how women were portrayed in Day's and Ryan's romantic comedies, it is necessary to journey back into film history for the provenance of women's films. Hollywood women's pictures were films created for primarily a female audience during the 1930s, 1940s, and early 1950s. Female audiences related to the fictional live the female stars portrayed in the film narratives or stories. This fictional

world represented women who were confident, assertive, strong, maternal, sisterly, ambivalent toward men, angry toward men, and excited and frightened about their independence. However, when the soldiers returned after World War II, the fictional world women influenced in film as scriptwriters, scenarists, art, set and costume directors, and film editors did not lead to gender equality in a male-dominated society. They could not realize their potential to achieve beyond the established stereotypical female roles of wives, mothers, nurses, and secretaries (Walsh 30; 43).

In the late 1950s, America was at peace and women's films were transformed. The female audiences were drawn to films that espoused "the feminine mystique," which promised fulfillment as a wife, mother, and life in suburbia (Walsh 2). During the 1950s and early 60s, film heroines like Doris Day were unrealistically romanticized and sexually exploited. By the late 1960s, the woman's movement effected changes in society and the movie heroines became characters that were realistic and faced tough choices and conflicts. Then in the 1970s, feminism brought about more changes in film resulting in a battle of the sexes between male and female characters. However, not all 1970s films were about sex and the working girl. Some explored female friendships, and women as victims. In other films from the mid-1970s, women characters were not given exciting roles depicting "real" women, because directors, writers and producers would not create women characters outside their traditional roles as wives, mothers, mistresses, secretaries, nurses, and prostitutes. With a lack of women directors, female characters had no voice.

Another problem was the female audience, which was more interested in television, and the public's interest in big-budget action and adventure films. Finally, in the 1970s, an ironic effect of the women's movement was the new male image in films—

sensitive, thoughtful, intelligent, gentle, emotional, caring and romantic, the qualities women thought men lacked ("Film and the Women's Movement"). Thus, women's films were transformed once again.

The changing Hollywood system transformed women's films from the 1940s to the 1960s and from 1985 to 1998. According to Andrea Walsh, a professor at Clark University where her research and teaching interests are on women's studies, the women films in the 1940s, when the men were away at war, became the purview of "educated, affluent, leisured, and 'liberated' women: writers, set designers, and film editors" (31). However, most women were not directors or cinematographers. Two women who were directors were Ida Lupino and Dorothy Arzner. A book review of *Ida Lupino: Beyond the Camera* describes how Ida did not want to be an actress; composing and writing were her major interests. Ida branched out into film directing and producing in 1949, an exception to the male-dominated field (Lupino and Anderson). However, in 1949 when Lupino's first film *Wanted* came out, she did not get credit. Instead, Elmer Clifton did. Before World War II, women who contributed to the filmmaking process did not receive recognition or their work was disguised (Muir 146).

Like Lupino, Dorothy Arzner was another exception to the male-dominated field. With confidence and determination, Arzner told the Production Head at Paramount, Mr. Schulberg, that she was leaving if she couldn't direct a film. Not wanting to lose Arzner to Columbia, Schulberg made her the writer-director of *Fashions for Women,* 1927, based on the play *The Best Dressed Woman in Paris.* This film catapulted her career. After seven years of hard work, working her way up in Paramount as a script typist, scriptwriter, and film editor, she received the recognition for directing her first film

("Dorothy Arzner Interview"), unlike Lupino, who did not.

Besides the directors, males dominated cinematography in the Hollywood studio system. And the major studios were identifiable by their cinematography. MGM, the most prosperous studio, had a unique visual style thanks to its lighting cameramen. Warner Brother's trademark was its "moody low-key styles" created by mobile camera work. Twentieth Century Fox was known for its widescreen process or Cinema-Scope. The smaller studios like Universal and Columbia had a few great cameramen. Big and small studio filmmakers depended on the cameramen to deliver the visual images, which conveyed ideas and emotions spatially (Giannetti 31; 33).

The major studios of the Hollywood studio system during the 1950s and 1960s were known as the Big Five: MGM, Warner Brothers, Paramount, Twentieth Century-Fox and RKO. They produced 90 percent of the fiction films in America and 80 percent that entertained foreign audiences. Most actors, female and male, were under exclusive contract with the Big Five. Top stars attracted audiences of which 65 percent preferred same sex stars. And star power meant audience loyalty expressed in fan letters and fan clubs. In 1934, 85 percent of the fan letters came from young females, and the number of fan clubs was 535 with a total of 750,000 members. The top box office stars were the ones with the most fans—Clark Gable, Jean Harlow, and Joan Crawford—all who worked for MGM (Giannetti 198-200).

As stars became powerful box-office draws, they made demands of the studios such as insisting on a specific director, producer, co-star, clothes designer, hair stylist, a lavish dressing room, and cameramen who could miraculously erase physical imperfection. Because the major studios realized their stars were a valuable box office

investment, their demands were a compensation for what the major studios demanded of the stars such as changing their name, learning how to talk, walk, wear costumes, attending arranged social activities for press exposure, and being subject to concocted "romances" for reporters and columnists covering the Hollywood scene (Giannetti 198).

Feminists who have criticized the male-dominated film industry for manipulating its female stars in the studio system did not give credit to the assertive stars that "voiced" their opinions in spite of the male-dominated industry. For example, Bette Davis didn't approve of the sexist advertisements for her film *The Corn is Green* (1945) and supported the rights of other actresses, and Olivia de Havilland proposed a novel for the screen adaptation of her film *To Each His Own* (1946). These two examples of female stars' assertiveness, in a male-dominated film industry, show that the woman's voice was not absent (Walsh 31-32).

Besides cinematography and star power, the major studios were identified by their characteristic style depicted by their star system. Paramount was known for comedy and the stars that delivered it—Mae West, the Marx Brothers, and Cary Grant. Warner Brothers, a male-dominated studio, was known for fast-moving melodramas played by stars like James Cagney and Humphrey Bogart. MGM, dubbed "The Tiffany Studio," had the most glamorous females (Giannetti 200).

The visual style of the major studios differed. Whether the studios called them production designers, set designers, or art directors, their job was to create a unique "look" for each film. For example, MGM's art director, Cedric Gibbons, gave each film "the Metro look" characterized by glamour and luxury, in a variety of styles and genres, and Warner Brother's art director, Anton Grot, created films set in "grubby, realistic

locales and his favored genres emphasized working-class life in gangster films, urban melodramas, and proletarian musicals" (Giannetti 248).

Common with the Big Five studios was the construction of permanent backlot sets for films such as "a European square, a turn-of-the-century street, or an urban slum" (Giannetti 248). If a new look was needed, backlots could be altered with new furnishings. Often backlots were close to the Hollywood studio, but at times sets were created outside Los Angeles where real estate was less costly. Also, outside Los Angeles, the studios purchased western frontier towns, ranches, and Midwestern type farms (Giannetti 249). According to British designer, Robert Mallet-Stevens, "a film set, in order to be a good set, must act…The sets must be intimately linked with the action" (qtd. in Giannetti 250).

The studio system often commissioned multiple screenwriters, which had their specialty like "dialogue, comedy, construction, atmosphere, and so on" (Giannetti 262). The best writers made the characters' dialogue believable and they knew how to tell the genre narrative. For example, John Ford was skilled at directing western films where the screenwriter's dialogue is "spare and poetic because the writing is understated" (Giannetti 263).

The movie directors of the studio system were part of a movie-making team, working independently within the major studios. They refrained from commenting on the script, casting, or editing. Considered craftsman, not artists, directors like Michael Curtiz, contracted by Warner Brothers, was known for his speed and efficiency (Giannetti 377). Curtiz's films were among the best and most profitable that Warner put out, such as *Captain Blood* (1935), *The Adventures of Robin Hood* (1938), *Angels With Dirty Faces*

(1938), *Casablanca* (1942), for which he won an Oscar, and *White Christmas* (1954). Most leading actors despised his dictatorial style, but they worked for him because he turned out top-notch movies. His critics attributed his success not to his directing ability, but his visual style, which the critics said was the work of Warner's cinematographers and art directors (Curtiz).

Besides the demands of the studio system, the film artists in the 1930s and 1940s were controlled by the Production Code, which was officially adopted in 1934, but actually is rooted in the Silent picture era. The Code's effect on women's films was contradictory. Only heterosexual relationships were portrayed and there was to be no excessive or lustful kissing or embracing or suggestive postures or gestures. Yet, the Code allowed independent and working women to be portrayed (Walsh 32-33). Clearly, the working heroine and her female friends made it easier for the studios to comply with the Code and still draw female audiences without the explicit sex. The Hays Office named after Will H. Hays, Hollywood's chief censor, strictly enforced the Code under pressure from religious groups and politicians until 1966 when the Code was supplanted by the voluntary movie ratings system ("Will Hays").

The Big Five studios thrived until the late 1940s when the U.S. Supreme Court declared their practices monopolistic and ordered them to relinquish their extensive chain theaters, which had guaranteed them audiences. With this judicial decision, the Studios no longer controlled the careers of their stars (Giannetti 200). Actors and directors went into business for themselves after the war. The privately owned corporations they formed allowed them to get lump sum payments, which were taxed lower than weekly salaries. The old studios still existed, but more as distributors of films produced by independents

that now hired screenwriters, producers, directors, stars, cinematographers, art directors and costume designers. Most importantly, the old studios financed the production. Unlike the six-week shooting schedules of the 1930s and 1940s, productions took a year or more to make (Belton 79-80).

From 1950 to 1960, Hollywood changed again. It was a technological institution, a psychological institution and a social institution. Technology gave the industry cameras, celluloid, microphones, amplifiers, magnetic recording tape, film laboratories, electricity, projectors, speakers, and screens. As a psychological institution, it encouraged the working-class and middle class to experience the habit of going to the movies as a leisure-time activity. Socially, the institution was a communal experience different from previous communal experiences such as churches, dance halls, social clubs, and saloons. Moreover, no matter how the industry changed technologically, psychologically, and socially, the cinema experience involved watching life-size images projected on a screen, which tells a story effortlessly and efficiently, because spectators receive the images spontaneously (Belton 5).

However, even though the cinema narratives of the 50s and 60s appeared to "magically come off the screen," they were a "classical" creation or a story that was told clearly, simply, orderly, symmetrically, and elegantly, avoiding excess like the Greek ideal of "nothing in excess" (Belton 22). Classical film narratives customarily begin with a conflict, problem, or goal, so something must happen to disrupt the state of things. By the end of the film, the conflict, problem, or goal is resolved or not resolved. And in between the beginning and end of the film, the sequence of events represents a process of disturbances that eventually move to "closure, completion, and conclusion" (Belton 23).

Characters are central to the classical cinema narrative. With plot-driven stories, it is the characters that interact with the events to accomplish their specific goals or solve the problems they are charged to solve. In the end, the characters either triumph or fail in their quest to overcome their struggle to reach their goals, solve their problems or conflicts—man against man, man against nature, or man against himself (Belton 24).

Classical movie narratives have characters that journey spatially and non-spatially. Spatially they may have specific destination(s) or geographic location(s) to reach. Non-spatially they may have to make deadlines, solve mysteries, fall in love, and come to terms with themselves or others. Thus, the characteristics of the classical movies are stories that avoid excess, begin with a conflict, problem or goal, and end with the conflict, problem or goal being solved or unsolved. They have characters that interact with the plot events and achieve success or failure accomplishing their goals, or solving problems, and the characters journey spatially and non-specially while the audience experiences what is a "great artifice" (Belton 27). However, audiences consciously or unconsciously must deny the movie's "artifice" to participate in the reality of the fiction if they want movie going to be pleasurable, rewarding and significant (Beldon 27).

The motion picture business in the 1950s and 1960s was a sophisticated industry, which relied on state-of-the-art machinery and thousands of skilled employees such as producers, directors, stars, screenwriters, art directors, costume designers, camera people, carpenters, electricians, and other skilled workers. Like a factory, the movie industry was controlled by a centralized management, which was responsible for the mechanical equipment, talented artists, production standards, and distribution and marketing strategies. Because films are one-of-a-kind items, and audiences bring home only a

memory, the movie business has no guaranteed audience. To reduce the risk of losing money on a film, the moguls of Hollywood stabilized the business by generating brand names in the form of recognizable stars, producers, directors, screenwriters, and familiar genres to attract audiences (Belton 63).

In the 1950s, the movie-going audience changed, giving rise to a "younger, better-educated, and more diverse audience." Because of economics, Hollywood was more conservative, avoiding subject matter that was politically controversial. It did not want to risk losing audiences, so the popular genres were war films, historical spectacles, Disney family films and musicals (Belton 285). Clearly, post-war audiences were emotionally drawn to films that were nostalgic, wholesome, euphoric, and an escape from reality.

As movie-going audiences evolved, genres came and went out of vogue. In the 1960s, two kinds of audiences were identified. The conservative, middle-aged, high school-educated, middle to lower- class audience went to historical spectacles, musicals, Doris Day and Rock Hudson sex comedies, Disney family movies, and James Bond spy thrillers. And a younger, college-educated, more affluent, middle-class liked films such as *The Graduate, Bonnie and Clyde,* and *Easy Rider.* This audience, which lasted until the mid-70s, was disenchanted and skeptical, having been influenced by nightclub comedian Lenny Bruce, cartoonist Jules Feiffer, and novelists Terry Southern, Joseph Heller, John Barth, and Kurt Vonnegut, Jr. (Belton 294-295).

By the mid-1970s, the audience became younger still. Almost half of the movie-going audience was between the ages of 12 and 20. By the end of the 1970s, the five top grossing films of all time were *Star Wars, Jaws, The Godfather, Grease,* and *Close Encounters of the Third Kind.* The film directors of these movies were young like their

audiences, men under the age of 35 (Belton 296).

However, in spite of audience changes due to societal changes, the romantic comedy became the female film during the classical Hollywood system of the 1960s and the new Hollywood system in the 80s and 90s. The factors that changed the romantic comedies filmed in the late 1950s to the mid-1960s as compared to those filmed from 1985 to the 1989 will show how women are portrayed.

Also telling of the time periods and gender is a study conducted by Stephen P. Powers, David J. Rothman and Stanley Rothman. Covering forty-four years of film making, these researchers found that women characters in the traditional Hollywood studio system, from 1946-1965, appear in nearly all of the 146 top grossing films. But, the leading women characters represent only 25 percent of all characters, making male characters dominant. The majority of the heroines are young, attractive, and motivated by romance with the goal to domesticate the man to be "good" husbands and fathers. The favorite genre is the light-hearted comedy. In fact, romance is the goal of the heroines for 50, 45, 41 and 44 percent of women from 1946-1955, 1956-1965, 1966-1975, and 1976-1989, respectively. On the contrary, men stars were less motivated by romance between 1946 and 1989 as determined by the percentages in four consecutive decades—21 percent from 1946-1955, 30 percent from 1956-1965, 14 percent from 1966-1975 and 17 percent from 1976-1989 (264-265). Consequently, one must consider if the time periods and/or gender is/are a factor(s) in this difference between men and women being motivated by romance.

Besides a significant difference between male and female characters motivated by

romance from 1946 to 1989, the number of men and women characters that marry, are married, or widowed is also significant. From 1946 to 1955, the percents were 29 for women and 12 men; from 1956-1965, the percents were 23 for women and 10 for men; from 1966-1975, the percents were 24 for women and 10 for men; and from 1976 to 1989, the percents were 17 for women and 8 for men (Powers, Rothman and Rothman 266). Therefore, one must consider if the time periods and/or gender is/are factor(s) in the difference between men and women characters that marry, are married, or widowed.

The women characters in traditional and nontraditional occupations in film changed significantly over the decades from 1946 to 1989. The traditional roles are housewife, elementary or secondary school teacher, nurse, secretary, and waitress. When the character becomes romantically involved and marries, work is no longer desirable or important. The nontraditional roles are college teachers, doctors, lawyers, CEOS, sales managers, military personnel, and other elite jobs. However, what is significant is that these elite women characters in the first and second decades, 1946-1965, are either married or pursuing men while working in careers, so romance for the single working nontraditional career woman is a goal. Also significant is the fact that the Production Code affected how women characters behaved. Sexual activity outside marriage was condemned in Hollywood movies before 1965 (Powers, Rothman and Rothman 266-268). Thus, moral rectitude and the goal to pursue romance were important variables, which affected film themes and character types.

Changes in women characters came after the sexual revolution, 1966-1989, because the movie industry was more liberal on censorship. Sexually explicit material appeared in the mid-60s and by the early 70s, many romantic relationships in film

emphasized sexuality, which continued to dominate in Hollywood films for the next twenty-five years. Audiences related to this more sexual relationship, for it mirrored their own lives. Moreover, female characters transformed from being focused on romance to roles depicting them as more complex, alienated, and violent (Powers, Rothman and Rothman 269).

According to researchers Powers, Rothman, and Rothman, the new Hollywood of filmmakers did not eradicate old myths but created new myths. For example, the goals and methods of the female characters, although negative, do not diminish their positive character ratings. Unlike the moguls of the traditional Hollywood system, who were moderate to conservative in their politics, the new filmmakers were liberal and cosmopolitan and eager to reform American society, but their attitudes were different from those of the American public as well as its secular and religious leaders. The moviemakers were critical of the Establishment. They believed the legal system favored the wealthy, and that American institutions needed reform. Nor did they identify with religion. Beginning in the mid-60s, they created top-grossing movies with a disparaging attitude toward government, religion, and the military (Powers and Rothman and Rothman 276), and the characters they created reflected their bias without regard for America's leadership or the public. Did, however, audiences approach the movie experience with a discerning eye, avoiding gullibility and being aware of propaganda? The question does raise the issue of audience manipulation by filmmakers regarding how women are portrayed in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally.*

In "A Fine Romance," David Denby, best known as a film critic for the *New Yorker,* gives a concise historical overview of the changes to the romantic comedies. He

contends that male and female actors in romantic comedies developed different personas over the decades. He laments the disappearance of the classical romantic comedies with elegant manners and men who were challenged intellectually and spiritually. The "new" comedy of the sexes, he asserts, is not about man gets girl with an ending that is moral and sentimental, but a combination of jokes and romance between childish, slovenly men and ambitious, serious and mature women. Denby also describes the ability of the camera to emphasize place, setting, and atmosphere as an important variable in the filming of successful romantic comedies. Clearly, Denby's analysis of classical romantic comedies and the "new" comedy of the sexes must be considered when discussing the cinematography and gender differences in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally*, which are classical and new, respectively.

Other considerations in viewing the romantic comedies *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally* are how the dialogue is delivered, the beauty and goodness stereotype, the female gaze and its fascination with materialism, the male gaze and its connection with the plot, the key elements of the romantic comedy, and the historical changes in the romantic genre.

According to David Shumway, a professor of English at Carnegie Mellon University, the characters in romantic comedies of the 30s and 40s did not talk realistically, for their language was wittier, more articulate, and more interesting than the speech of ordinary people, but that is what audiences wanted (Anderson). Shumway's observation of characters' dialogue in the romantic comedies of the 30s and 40s requires examination of Day and Ryan's female dialogue. What did Day and Ryan's audiences expect in the way of conversation between the sexes?

Besides the dialogue used in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally* to portray women, the "beauty-and-goodness" stereotype may be an important factor in the way women are portrayed. In 1999, social psychologists, Stephen Smith, William McIntosh, and Doris Bazzini, conducted two studies to discover if the beautiful are good in Hollywood. The first study investigated the role of U.S. films in the "beauty-and-goodness" stereotype. As one might expect, the results of this study, which looked at male and female characters from 1940-1989, indicate that "Hollywood filmmakers portray physically attractive individuals more favorably than less attractive individuals in terms of their moral goodness, romantic activity, and life outcomes, and this was most significant for the central characters" (75). The second study investigated "the validity of biased films strengthening stereotypes in favor of attractive people." The conclusion of these researchers is that the power of mass media influences human attitudes and judgments. However, the assumption that filmmakers are responsible for "public beliefs and stereotypes" may not be valid (77). How do *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally* measure up to the findings of these studies on the "beauty-and-goodness" stereotype?

In addition to dialogue and the "beauty-and- goodness" stereotype, the female or male gaze may affect how the audience sees women portrayed in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally.* According to Paula Marantz Cohen, a literary critic, academic nonfiction writer and a humanities professor at Drexel University, romantic comedies "glorify material things and make them an expression and an extension of the self" (79). Cohen quotes Madonna's idiom, the "material girl" to say that material things appeal to men and women audiences, but more so to the *"*female gaze*"* or what lures women. Moreover, Cohen acknowledges that her opinion is in opposition to film theorist, Laura

Mulvey. Mulvey purports that "the balance of plot and spectacle in Hollywood films is designed for the *"*male gaze.*"* The film's plot portion, she says, is its linear storytelling function, which is similar to the male sex act in its insistent forward motion, its drive for closure and conclusion. In other words, women characters are the spectacle, so they do not move the plot forward but are "useful resting points and diversionary asides, made part of the hero's reward at the end of the story" (79). Furthermore, Mulvey contends that plot and spectacle influences female and male homosexual viewers who are "expected to mimic or acquiesce, buying into the plot-spectacle scenario where the action of the plot is primary and spectacle (women and objects) is secondary" (80). In summary, Cohen believes romantic comedy spectacle is central and plot is secondary, and Mulvey believes romantic comedy plot is primary and spectacle is secondary. Cohen's vision of romantic comedy is that male and female characters have a material presence and relationship to things and plot has nothing to do with the genre. It is women who are center stage, because women have more accessories than men, which explains why women who are middle class or above have access to the expressive and expensive items that define *spectacle.* The material trappings like clothes, accessories, and furniture are not connected to sexual desirability, but are instead aesthetic elements, elements that are "bulwarks of the self." Thus, the elements of "spectacle" empower the women characters (81-83).

Cohen differs with David Shumway on dialogue. She sees dialogue as an adjunct to style like clothes and accessories, serving as permission for women to be themselves no matter how outlandish or idiosyncratic. Along with dialogue, clothes and accessories is the larger material context of home and furnishings. A display of wealth is in itself not

seductive, but part of self-expression. Thus, Cohen believes the dialogue and material world serve to showcase character, "being present and artful in every choice regarding the self" (85-87). The question to ponder when viewing *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally* comedies is, whose interpretation of romantic comedies is correct—Mulvey's or Cohen's?

Furthermore, the key elements of the romantic comedy may affect how audiences see women portrayed. Leger Grindon, a professor of Film and Media Culture at Middlebury College, reviewed Celestino Deleyto's latest book on romantic comedy, *The Secret Life of Romantic Comedy* (2009). Deleyto has written books on romantic comedy and he is a professor of Film Studies and Literature at the University of Zaragoza, Spain. For Deleyto, the "romantic comedy essentially involves three key constituents: a narrative about love, gender, and sexual relationships; a space of magical transformation that frees the characters from inhibitions so they can explore their desire, and humor which establishes a benevolent perspective. Moreover, he contends that romantic comedies do not have to require a happy ending. They can have a wide range of endings that are flexible." Furthermore, Deleyto says, "The genre central theme is not so much the conventional union [of the heterosexual couple], as the vicissitudes of the emotional and sexual relationships between the characters" (Grindon Web).

Reviewing Deleyto's book, *The Secret Life of Romantic Comedy*, Grindon says, Deleyto argues that space is important in romantic comedy because it "allows the spectator to glimpse a 'better world' a world which is not governed by inhibitions and repressions but is instead characterized by a freer, more optimistic expression of love and desire" (83). In other words, says Grindon, "humor ensures the benevolent atmosphere in

such romantic enclaves. From here the promise of romance takes shape" (83). Finally, Grindon's review of Deleyto's book is positive because of his theoretical approach, critical argument, and textual analysis. Grindon's negative comment is that Deleyto "downplays a historical perspective" (83). For the purposes of this dissertation, an historical perspective of the romantic comedy will be addressed.

Besides reviewing Deleyto's book, Grindon reviews Tamar Jeffers McDonald's *Romantic Comedy: Boy Meets Girl Meets Genre,* which is more historical than Deleyto's book, because it emphasizes the historical change in the romantic genre, namely four successive subgenres of romantic comedy: screwball (1934-42); sex comedy (1953-65); "radical" romantic comedy (1967-86); and "neo-traditional" romantic comedy (late 1980s—present). McDonald says in her book "the basic ideology the romantic comedy genre supports is the primary importance of the couple" (13). Thus, Grindon interprets this to mean, "the author understands romantic comedy as arising from traditional practices of courtship, gender relations, and sexual intimacy, such that the genre has an essentially conservative relationship to social values rather than being frivolous entertainment" (83). Because McDonald's perspective on romantic comedy is historical, this dissertation will discuss the portrayal of women from McDonald's characterization of the subgenres represented in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally*.

On a final note, there is another definition of the "male and female gaze." Unlike Paula Marantz Cohen and Laura Mulvey, who have different opinions about the "male gaze" and the "female gaze" in relationship to spectacle and plot, there is the idea that because men control the film industry, the masculine point of view is the "male gaze." This idea must be considered when understanding how women are portrayed in

Pillow Talk and *When Harry Met Sally*.

Anne Ross Muir, a freelance television director and author of *A Woman's Guide to Jobs in Film and Television,* 1987, (*The Female Gaze* 211-212), says because men control the film and television industry, many women do not try to enter the industry. However, she implores women to improve this situation, for women should have an equal opportunity for careers alongside men in film and television. Statistically, in the 1950s, women represented 18 percent of the labor force within the industry, and 15 percent in 1975, but these were low status jobs exclusively held by women who were paid low wages. In 1986, out of 306 camera operators, only 12 were women; out of 1,395 engineers, only 19 were women; out of 277 sound technicians, only 8 were females (Muir 143-144). More alarming is the fact that when technology gets sophisticated and requires technical expertise, women are at a disadvantage. For example, "editing used to be a creative, artistic job in which women were successful. But with the advent of the video, many companies began recruiting their editors from amongst the engineering staff, which means that, since there are so few women working in technical areas, there may be almost no female editors in the future" (151). Moreover, Muir contends that in the new Hollywood system equality for women was more difficult to organize because the workforce was largely freelance and therefore constantly moving. However, consumers support films made by women about women's lives like *Desperately Seeking Susan,* 1985, which was a box office success, establishing that movies made by women are worth backing, thus paving the way for female directors, writers and technicians (149). Muir further states, "because of productions by women about women, a new wave of academic scholarship has emerged from feminist film critics who have identified ways in

which the cinema discriminates against women and perpetuates images which are harmful to all of us" (150). Her recommendation for overcoming discrimination against women in film and television is "to have access to these important media for self-expression and mass communication, [a]nd only when we share control of the means of production, can we fully establish a 'female gaze' within popular culture and present women's point of view in all its fascinating multiplicity" (152). Her point is well taken. In determining how women are portrayed in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally*, it will be important to establish whose gaze is being delivered—male or female.

In fact, whose gaze, male or female, seems to be delivered by Brad Allen when he says to Jan Morrow, "Don't tell me this young fellow was trying to force his attention on you. There is one thing I can't stand—a man that tries to take advantage of a woman. We make short work of this kind back in Texas I can tell ya." Or, when Harry Burns says to Sally Albright, "Had my dream again. Where I was making love and the Olympic judges are watching. I nailed the compulsories. This is it. The finals. I got a nine from the Canadians. A perfect ten from the American. . . ." Do the screenwriters, film editors, and directors control the gaze, so the Day and Ryan female characters regarding their dialogue deliver audiences an intentional perception of the portrayal of women?

This dissertation aims to show how women are portrayed in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally*, two popular romantic comedies. In fact, romantic comedies were a popular genre of women films, from 1950-1965 and from 1985-1998. Using Tamar Jeffers McDonald's historical perspective on the genre, the female characters in Doris Day's *Pillow Talk*, and Meg Ryan's *When Harry Met Sally* will be compared and contrasted. Under consideration is the female and/or male gaze delivered by

screenwriters, film editors and directors, the influence of star power on the female/male audience, and how the female characters represent their unique societies regarding dialogue, gender relations, courtship, sexuality, marriage, fashion, career choice, self-confidence, and empowerment. Moreover, this dissertation will discuss the points of view by renowned film and literary critics, and the dissertation author's gaze to support the thesis that the females in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally* seek self-fulfillment through marriage while reflecting the social structure of their time period.

CHAPTER 2

ROMANTIC COMEDIES

A romantic comedy is a type of film genre or category of motion picture production. Genres are Hollywood inventions, which follow strict guidelines to create a "mass-oriented" product (McDonald 7). They are important to the film industry because they stabilize it by controlling the entertainment experience of moviegoers much like brand name products have control over the consumer. With the proven success of "one-of- a- kind" films or genres, movie producers reduce production risks by assuming that audiences will return to see a film similar in nature. That is, the film has familiar elements and novel elements, which give the audience a unique experience with the same genre. For instance, the first James Bond movie, *Dr. No (1962),* had a $1.1 million budget and grossed $59.5 million in the box office; therefore, sequels of the secret agent genre followed (Belton 116).

Jo Berry and Angie Errigo, authors of *Chick Flicks: Movies Women Love,* believe romantic comedies provide the moviegoer with "easy, uncomplicated pleasures" (McDonald 7). McDonald does not agree. She contends that the effects of romantic comedies on the audience are more complex, because the viewer must consider what is real and what is fantasy. For example, in referring to the *The Prince and Me* (2004), McDonald is annoyed when Paige contemplates giving up her dream to become a doctor for love, which the film suggests is the 'right' choice. However, Paige doesn't give up on her dream. She leaves her love, Eddie, the Crown Prince of Denmark, to finish her university studies. McDonald felt cheated if this romantic comedy would not end happily. She expected the genre to deliver a happy ending even though she wanted Paige to fulfill

her dream. The actual ending turns out happy, but unrealistic for McDonald. In real life, the circumstances would not have been so perfect like when the Prince agrees that Paige become a doctor, marry him, and as a future Queen have a job (McDonald 6). Supporting McDonald's viewpoint that the viewer must consider what is real and imaginative about romantic comedies is Ledger Grindon, a professor of Film and Media Culture at Middlebury College, USA. He says romantic comedies should not be promoted only as fantasies about love. In fact, William Shakespeare, Jane Austen, and Oscar Wilde have enriched society with romantic comedies. Thus, romantic comedies are worthy of study for they deal with realistic conflicts, which reflect the human experience regarding courtship, sexuality, and gender relations (Grindon 1).

According to film critic, Brian Henderson, the comedy discourse and laughter must be linked in the romantic comedy genre. But defining this genre is difficult, for many Hollywood films have romance and comedy as the primary components (*The Film Comedy Reader 310).* This is a problem says McDonald, for defining this genre is subject to film reviews, the works of theorists, production and marketing material, advertising, DVDs and videos (9). For example, *Bring It On* (2000) is not a romantic comedy, but *Get Over It* (2001) is. The central couple's romance in each film is different. In *Bring It On*, Kirsten Dunst, a high school student involved in a cheerleading contest, is trying to win the heart of her brother's best friend, Cliff (Jesse Bradford). Dunst's character, Torrence, wants to win the contest, which is more important than winning the boy. Thus, love is secondary. *Get Over It* is a romantic comedy because Dunst's character, Kelly, a high school student involved in a school musical, is trying to win the heart of her brother's best friend, Burke (Ben Foster). Even though she wins a part in the musical, her primary

actions are to get Burke to get over his old girlfriend and fall in love with her. Thus, winning the boy's love is the crucial factor for defining this film as a romantic comedy. By contrasting these two films, McDonald defines the romantic comedy genre. She says its central narrative is a quest for love, which portrays this quest in a light-hearted way and almost always to a successful conclusion (9). Moreover, McDonald does not suggest that the romantic comedy must be heterosexual by citing several films like *Go Fish* (1994) and *Saving Face* (2004). Furthermore, she uses the word 'light-hearted' in the definition to indicate that romantic comedies generally end well, but can elicit mixed emotions—laughs and tears. For instance, in *Sleepless in Seattle*, the quest for love is the primary goal, with comic and tearful moments (10).

McDonald's definition of romantic comedy has similar elements to other definitions of the genre. An American Film Institute 2008 poll defined romantic comedy as "a genre in which the development of romance leads to comic situations" (Grindon 1). Billy Mernit, screenwriter, script consultant, teacher at UCLA's Extension Writers' Program and author of *Writing the Romantic Comedy*, contends that the romance must be the primary story element (13). Gerald Mast, author, film historian, and faculty member of the University of Chicago, explains that the genre creates a comic climate, the drama poses serious problems like choosing a life partner, and the process is light-hearted, anticipating a positive resolution (9-13). In other words, the tone is humorous and the plot is the courtship. And Celestino Deleyto says, "The romantic comedy is engaged in the discourse of love while representing the shifting practice of, and evolving ideas about romance in our culture" (Grindon 2). Moreover, Deleyto argues that "romantic comedy involves three key constituents: a narrative about love, gender, and

sexual relationships; a space of magical transformation that frees the characters from inhibitions so they can explore their desire; and humor which establishes a benevolent perspective." He does not believe the romantic comedies require a happy ending. He observes a wide range of endings and flexible resolutions within the genre (Grindon Web).

The romantic comedies, like other genres, are subject to audience taste and industry trends, causing a rise and fall in popularity, says Ledger Grindon. However, romantic comedies are the most enduring as he explains the genre's historical development in terms of distinct cycles or clusters of films, which are similar during a limited period of time. By dividing the genre into nine cycles or clusters, Grindon's goal is to show how the genre has been shaped by the interaction of the film industry, creative artists, and society: 1930-1933, the transition to sound cluster; 1934-1942, the screwball cycle; 1942-1946, the World War II cluster; 1947-1953, the post-war cluster; 1953-1966, the comedies of seduction cycle; 1967-1976, the transition through the counter-culture cluster; 1977-1987, the nervous romance cycle; 1986-1996, the reaffirmation of romance cycle; 1997 to the present, the grotesque and ambivalent cycle (25-26).

Just as Grindon presents a historically minded approach of the romantic comedy genre, Tamar Jeffers McDonald offers her historical perspective of the genre, which are four successive subgenres of romantic comedy: 1934-1942, screwball; 1953-1965, sex comedy; 1967-1986, "radical" romance comedy; late 1980s-present, "neo-traditional" romantic comedy (Grindon Web).

According to McDonald, romantic comedies, like other genres, constitute three chief characteristics—visual iconography, narrative patterns, and ideology. Locations,

props, costume and stock characters provide the visual iconography. To illustrate this characteristic of romantic comedies, the setting in contemporary romantic comedies may be urban. The props may be flowers, chocolates, candlelight, and beds. The costume, a special big date outfit. The stock characters often are unsuitable at the start of the film. However, by the end of the film, the stock characters find a suitable partner, an action, which evolves romantically. For instance, in the beginning of the film *You've Got Mail* (1998), Joe's (Tom Hanks) girlfriend, Patricia (Parker Posey) is wrong for him. And Kathleen (Meg Ryan) is wrong for Frank (Greg Kinnear). By the end of the film, Joe and Kathleen are a couple (McDonald 15).

The setting can convey a lot of information. Besides the backdrop of the action, it can reveal the theme and characterization. Thus, Giannetti offers eight characteristics to consider when analyzing a set (252):

1. Exterior or interior. If the set is an exterior, how does nature function as a symbolic analogue to the mood, theme, or characterization?
2. Style. Is the set realistic and lifelike, or is it stylized and deliberately distorted? Is it in a particular style, such as colonial American, art deco, sleet contemporary, etc.?
3. Studio or location. If the set is an actual location, why was it chosen? What does it say about the characters?
4. Period. What era does the set represent?
5. Class. What is the apparent income level of the owners?
6. Size. How large is the set? Rich people tend to take up more space than the poor, who are usually crowded in their living area.

7. Decoration. How is the set furnished? Are there any status symbols, oddities of taste, etc.?
8. Symbolic function. What kind of overall image does the set and its furnishings project?

Costumes and makeup are a symbolic form of communication that can also reveal aspects of character and theme. For example, a costume style can depict class, self-image and psychological states. The cut and texture can suggest delicacy, dignity, fastidiousness, and even agitation. Consequently, Giannetti offers ten characteristics to consider when analyzing costumes (253; 256):

1. Period. What era does the costume fall into? Is it an accurate reconstruction? If not, why?
2. Class. What is the apparent income level of the person wearing the costume?
3. Sex. Does a women's costume emphasize her femininity, or is it neutral or masculine? Does a man's costume emphasize his virility, or is it fussy or effeminate?
4. Age. Is the costume appropriate to the character's age, or is it deliberately too youthful, dowdy, or old-fashioned?
5. Fabric. Is the material coarse, sturdy and plain, or sheer and delicate?
6. Accessories. Does the costume include jewelry, hats, canes, and other accessories? What kind of shoes?
7. Color. What are the symbolic implications of the colors? Are they "hot" or "cool"? Subdued or bright? Solids or patterns?
8. Body exposure. How much of the body is revealed or concealed? The more body

revealed, the more erotic the costume. Is it form fitting or shapeless?

9. Function. Is the costume meant for leisure or for work? Is it meant to impress by its beauty and splendor, or is it merely utilitarian?
10. Image. What is the overall impression that the costume creates—sexy, constricting, boring, gaudy, conventional, eccentric, prim, cheap looking, elegant?

Film characters choose makeup associated with their character. Stars like Garbo, Monroe, and Harlow wore makeup to look ethereal. Marlene Deitrich went for the glamour look. Brando and Olivier used false noses, wigs, and distorting cosmetics to change their familiar features. And Mia Farrow's pale green face in *Rosemary's Baby* was used to suggest that the devil's child corrupted her body (Giannetti 258).

The public creates stars that have enormous influence with fashion, values and public behavior. To quote Marilyn Monroe, "only the public can make a star…and it's the studios who try to make a system out of it" (Belton 93). However, the public only selects certain actors and actresses for stardom. The stars are chosen because they fulfill a public need or concern and they live up to the public's image of them. Each generation of audiences has its own stars or stock characters. For example, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, Rock Hudson and Doris Day were stars known for their clean good looks and sexual propriety in sex comedies. Then they went out of vogue with the public in favor of action and adventure stars of the 1970s and 1980s like Sean Connery, Clint Eastwood, Harrison Ford, Sylvester Stallone, and Arnold Schwarzenegger (Belton 93-95). Moreover, as British film critic Raymond Drugnat observed, "the social history of a nation can be written in terms of its film stars"(Giannetti 193).

Beginning around 1900, a story of some kind structured fiction films. The first

fifteen years the narratives were crude until D. W. Griffith, an iconic American film director, perfected them from his observation of live theater to become “classical cinema” (Giannetti 266). “Classical cinema,” which dates back to the theater of ancient times, is story oriented. A conflict arises between the protagonist and the antagonist. The protagonist initiates the action and the antagonist resists it. Most films in this form present an implied question: How will the protagonist get what he or she wants in spite of considerable obstacles? The subsequent scenes intensify the conflict while the action rises. As the action escalates, a cause-effect pattern links each scene to the next. Lesser conflicts are suppressed or subordinated, so the central conflict can intensify until it reaches its maximum tension in the climax. It is at the climax that the protagonist and antagonist clash in order for the confrontation to reach its resolution. The narrative ends with a closure such as a wedding, a death in tragedies, or a return to normal. Thus, “classical cinema” consists of three constituent parts: unity, plausibility, and coherence (Giannetti 232).

Classifying narrative structures is achieved by genre, or story type with a characteristic set of conventions in style, values and subject matter. Genre is also a method of organizing the story, but innovation is important to prevent imitation of the subject matter and style of the film. Moreover, genres that attract gifted artists elevate the status of the genre. For example, the earliest film critics considered slapstick comedy an infantile genre until Chaplin and Keaton brought prestige to the genre (Giannetti 268-269).

The narrative patterns in the romantic comedies are small and large and repeated. The large narratives are the wider story arc and the smaller narratives are the tropes or

occurrences, which happen repeatedly (McDonald 12). Examples of common romantic comedy troupes with filmic examples are the following: The falling over slapstick trope in *That Touch of Mink* and *Sleepless in Seattle*; the adversarial relationship turning to love trope in *Pillow Talk* and *You've Got Mail*; break-up and makeup trope in *Pillow Talk* and *Lover Come Back*; her friend's advice vs. his friend's advice trope in *When Harry Met Sally*; love montage trope in *Pillow Talk, Lover Come Back* and *You've Got Mail*; masquerade trope in *Pillow Talk, Lover Come Back* and *You've Got Mail*; meet cute girl trope in *That Touch of Mink* and *Sleepless in Seattle* (McDonald 118).

In order to understand how narratives work, the film is broken down into its narrative units for structural analysis. This process is called *segmentation* and it is used to examine scenes, parts of scenes or the entire film. If an entire film is segmented, it is broken down into its largest units and smaller units to analyze the unities of action, time, and/or space. However, most films do not observe all three unities. Even if a film violates the use of all three unities, the segmentation process can reveal the film's thematic concerns, which is important to the film's analysis (Belton 28-29).

French Marxist Louis Althusser influenced many film scholars in the 1970s and 1980s and continues to influence film critics today. Althusser espoused that comedy and tragedy have different subject matters. For the romantic comedy, the subject matter is very specific. It is about love and marriage and it celebrates and reinforces marriage, monogamy and heterosexuality even though heterosexual monogamy in contemporary western society is in a crisis. The happy ending, which is an important convention of the genre, can be the separation of the lovers like in these twenty-first-century movies: *Good Company* (2004), *Prime* (2005) or *The Break-Up* (2006) (Deleyto 25).

Tamar Jeffers McDonald recognizes that the ideology of the romantic comedies reflects a society's desires, anxieties and assumptions at a specific time (13). For example, Deleyto points out that romantic comedies have changed drastically in the twentieth century because sexual and affective protocols have evolved in very rapid and sometimes radical ways; therefore, affecting the way people behave with respect to love and sex (47). But many theorists believe the genre's ideology spreads a false consciousness about gender relations, courtship, and sexuality. One criticism is that these films are transparent. The intent of the plot is obvious, getting the men and women together, such as in the films *You've Got Mail* and *Sleepless in Seattle*. Other criticisms are that the films lack originality, and they appeal only to female audiences. However, McDonald says these films appeal to both men and women because perfect love appeals to both audiences, and the narratives demonstrate that both men and women have to change and adapt to deserve love. For example, once a woman discovers a man's deceit, the man has to change in order to deserve her love again. Moreover, the romantic comedy films encourage men to remake themselves when they see the romantic comedy male living in a nice apartment, wearing designer clothes, listening to music on an expensive stereo system, and looking fitter (McDonald 15-19). Clearly, the genre is selling audiences' love, and products to everyone.

Mark D. Rubinfeld, Assistant Professor of Sociology at Loyola University in New Orleans, where he specializes in popular culture, identifies four plots which depict how couples are "bound to bond." Specifically, the Hollywood romantic comedies use the pursuit, redemption, foil, and permission plots to show different love stories with different prescriptions, one for men and one for women, for finding and sustaining a

loving relationship. Moreover, these plots have an ideological message by showing how much the Hollywood romantic comedy is conservative and traditional in its values (3-4).

Critics Mast and Rowe contend that romantic comedies do not have a predetermined ideology. Instead, they find a range of political expression in the genre. Mast argues that comedy can uphold social values when the comic character is urged to reform or criticize established norms through the antisocial behavior of the comic protagonist (Mast 20-21). Rowe contends that romantic comedies have two dominant characteristics, anti-authoritarianism and its impulse toward renewal and social transformation. The woman does not want to be controlled. She demands recognition and social change in the "ascendancy of the young couple" (101-102).

Deleyto, professor of Film and English Literature at the University of Zaragoza, Spain, argues that romantic comedies do not have a specific ideology; that is, a single discourse, which upholds the values of marriage and the heterosexual couple's stability. Instead, he says romantic comedies are thematic: "The genre's central theme is not so much that conventional union of the heterosexual couple, as the vicissitudes of the emotional and sexual relationships between the characters" (29). By focusing on themes, Deleyto is moving away from the Althusserian point of view among scholars that genres are politically significant in that they support or subvert the status quo. Specifically, the Hollywood romantic comedy spreads illusions about love such as lovers united in marriage live happily ever after. Thus, the ideology romantic comedy spreads is a false awareness regarding gender relations, courtship, and sexuality (Grindon 77-78).

Deleyto believes films may carry ideological messages, but genres are subject to social circumstances, which filmmakers adopt, modify, or avoid in romantic comedy

discourse. For example, the happy ending associated with the genre, are varied in contemporary romantic comedies with "the lonely hero, the uneasy couple, a nostalgia for a more innocent past, the uncertainty of changing roles, and the increasing visibility of homosexuality, which indicate the shift in contemporary mores and their expression in romantic comedies" (42-54). Thus, these range of endings depict flexibility and break from ideological rigidity (29).

Deleyto defines the romantic comedy genre as:

> The intersection of three, closely related elements: a narrative that articulates historically and culturally specific views of love, desire, sexuality and gender relationships; a space of transformation and fantasy which influences the narrative articulation of those discourses; and humor as the specific perspective from which the fictional characters, their relationships and the spectator's response to them are constructed as embodiments of those discourses (46).

These three characteristics in a given text can be fragmentary or intermittent, but they are not static, for they are subject to unpredictable evolution that is culturally relevant or not culturally relevant (47). He offers a theoretical approach to the genre whereas Grindon and McDonald approach the genre from a historical perspective.

Major movie genres are broad types of films like musicals, comedies, horror films, westerns, action-adventure films and war films. When broken down into subgenres or subdivisions, it is a specific category of film. For example, subgenres of a horror film are vampire, mad doctor, and slasher films. Comedy subdivisions are slapstick, romantic, and screwball (Belton 115).

Using Tamar Jeffers McDonald's historical perspective of romantic comedies,

which she breaks down into subgenres, I will discuss how women are portrayed in Doris Day's *Pillow Talk* and Meg Ryan's *When Harry Met Sally*. McDonald says the Doris Day films are sex comedies, which pit woman against man, but both have the same goal, sex. However, women want sex after marriage and men want sex before or without marriage (38-39). On the other hand, McDonald says the Meg Ryan films are neo-traditional because they come from romantic dramas, which emphasize the importance of tears. Heterosexuality, forming a lasting relationship in the context of the boy meets, loses, and regains the girl structure, defines this subgenre (85-86).

Moreover, McDonald provides thematic characteristics common to the sex comedy and neo-traditional subgenres. For sex comedy, "there is disguise and masquerade, a hierarchy of knowledge, and reversions, inversions of the natural order" (45). For neo-traditional, "there is a mood of imprecise nostalgia, a more vague self-referentialism, and a de-emphasizing of sex" (91). Thus, a discussion of these thematic characteristics are important to understanding how women are portrayed in the Day and Ryan romantic comedies.

Clearly, how women are portrayed in Day's *Pillow Talk* and Ryan's *When Harry Met Sally* must take into consideration the culture of each time period, the narrative elements of character, setting, plot, themes, tone, mood, and point of view delivered by the story, and the changes in the Hollywood system. For example, when the production code became more liberal after 1968, the major Hollywood studios lost their power to control the entire production of film, and the directors, screenwriters, and producers were no longer composed only of men. Consequently, comparing Doris Day and Meg Ryan and how they portray women is a journey back into cinema history.

CHAPTER 3

HOW WOMEN ARE PORTRAYED IN THE DORIS DAY ROMANTIC COMEDY *PILLOW TALK* (1959)

Film scholar Tamar Jeffers McDonald presents a historical perspective of the Hollywood romantic comedy genre, which she divides into subgenres. Sex Comedy is the subgenre she identifies for the years 1953-1965. However, she points out that sex comedy is still present in later romantic comedies with the example of the romantic comedy *Laws of Attraction* (2004). Recurrent tropes or smaller narratives from its past subgenres occur in this and other contemporary romantic comedy. These tropes are enduring because they give "energy and drive to the story line." Thus, the sex comedy is not restricted to the mid-1950s to mid-1960s because much of the pleasure and energy of the film comes from the couple's efforts to not only resist each other, but also to deny their compatibility and inevitable union even though the contemporary romantic comedies represent different historical contexts reflecting the societal mores at the time of production (38-39).

The development of the Hollywood sex comedy was the result of three significant events in 1953. The first event was the Alfred Kinsey report on *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female.* Kinsey interviewed 5,940 unmarried white 30-year-old American women about their sexual experiences, and just over half were not virgins, which was shocking and startling in 1953, for it dismissed the "double standard" that only men were supposed to have pre-marital sex (McDonald 41).

The second event in the development of the sex comedy was the first publication of *Playboy* in November/December 1953. The monthly magazine articles were dedicated to the enjoyment of a range of sensual pleasures. For example, the magazine had articles

listing must-have items for the bachelor's pleasure like a stereo, records, and alcohol, which would increase his chances of luring a woman to his apartment for sex. Therefore, the sex comedies in the mid-1950s took advantage of *Playboy's* emphasis on consumables. They targeted men and women to purchase items, which translated into good taste and culture such as in the furnishing of the bachelor pad as a luxurious lair to invite women (McDonald 41-42).

The third event for creating the sex comedy context was the film *The Moon is Blue*, which contained the first use of the word "virgin." It was released without the approval of the Production Code Administration (PCA), because of the film's racy narrative, and candid language. By challenging the PCA, the director of the film, Otto Preminger, generated audience interest which translated into the film's success. Consequently, other filmmakers challenged the PCA's power. In a weakened state, from 1956-1966, the PCA "lifted all remaining taboos except nudity, sexual perversion and venereal disease." In other words, the PCA allowed the discussion and narration of sexual topics, but there was no sex enacted in the sex comedy (McDonald 42-43).

The popularity of the sex comedy lasted a decade, from around 1954-1964. By the mid-1960s, with the availability of birth control, women no longer feared unwanted pregnancy. Thus, the sex comedies were out of touch with the times when a new moral climate emerged. "Nice" girls would not have to insist on marriage before sex (McDonald 43).

McDonald's definition of sex comedy highlights the sexual and adversarial aspects of the subgenre because she contends these films "pit woman against man in an elemental battle of wits, in which the goal of both is sex. Only the timing and legitimacy

of this differs from gender to gender, with women wanting sex after, and men before or without, marriage" (38).

The film *Pillow Talk* permanently changed the star personae of Doris Day and Rock Hudson, the two main characters, because it initiated a series of sex comedies, which at the time were considered racy at the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s (McDonald 51). The importance of this film to this study is to show how analyzing its visual characteristics, narrative patterns, plots, themes, mood, tone, and ideology portrays women. The visual characteristics are the setting, costume, make-up, and stock characters, which can reveal the theme and characterization. The narrative patterns are small and large and repeated. The large pattern is the wider story arc and the smaller patterns are the tropes or occurrences, which happen repeatedly (McDonald 12-13). These large and small narratives, which help to analyze the action, time, and/or space, can reveal the film's thematic concerns (Belton 28). The plots depict how couples are "bound to bond" to show different love stories with different prescriptions, one for men and one for women, for finding and sustaining a loving relationship while sending an ideological message (Rubinfeld 3-4). The ideology of a film reflects a society's desires, anxieties and assumptions at a specific time (McDonald 15).

In *Pillow Talk,* Jan Morrow (Doris Day) and Brad Allen (Rock Hudson), the two main characters, are brought together because they have a problem sharing a "party line" or one telephone line with two different numbers. Brad, a playboy and songwriter, is always using the telephone to romance one woman after another, singing to them a supposedly "original" love song, so Jan, a single and serious interior designer, never can make work-related phone calls. Consequently, a feud develops over the use of the party

line. However, one evening in a nightclub, Brad accidently sees Jan dancing and is attracted to her. Just how the feud gets resolved is telling of how Jan portrays women in this romantic sex comedy.

The film's visual characteristics tell how women are portrayed. Film scholar Louis Giannetti offers eight characteristics to consider about the set, and ten characteristics to consider about the costume (252-256). The set considerations are these: exterior or interior; style; studio or location; period; class; size; decoration; symbolic function. The costume considerations are these: Period; class; sex; age; fabric; accessories; color; body exposure; function; image (253-256). Besides the film's visual characteristics, the narrative patterns and society's desires, anxieties, assumptions in 1959 portray women.

Scene Two serves as the exposition section of the narrative arc. The director, Michael Gordon, introduces the time, 1959, the place, New York City, and the cultural context, which romanticized and exploited females making them unrealistic. The stock characters are Caucasian, twenty-something, educated, and moneyed. The Production Code allowed Hollywood to depict independent working-women without the explicit sex.

The narrative begins with a conflict and a problem, which is the feud between Jan and Brad over the party line they share. Even though the plot problem is sharing the party line, the narrative structure is the pursuit plot consisting of a quest, obstacle, and resolution of the love story. In between the beginning and end of the film, the sequence of events represent a process that reaches the goal, which is social regeneration through coupling or marriage. Moreover, the pursuit plot narrative supports traditional gender roles and a patriarchal ideology.

The narrative trope in Scene One is Jan singing “Pillow Talk.” The narrative tropes in Scene Two are the feud between Jan and Brad over the party line; the quest for love and marriage for Eileen and Yvette; Jan’s alcoholic maid’ s problems; Jan’s action to get a private phone line; Mr. Pierot’s frustration with Mrs. Walters.

Scenes One and Two have interior settings. Jan Morrow, Brad, Eileen, and Yvette are in their New York apartments. Jan’s settings are the bedroom, kitchen, apartment hallway, and Manhattan. Brad’s setting is his living room. Eileen and Yvette’s setting is their bedrooms.

In Scene One, Jan is on her bed singing “Pillow Talk”. The lyrics tell the audience that she talks to her pillow about “the boy she will marry someday, somehow, someway, some time.” Obviously, the lyrics support a patriarchal ideology. Jan is single, twenty-something, and she has her own apartment. This is a woman with means to have a fashionable, sophisticated life style. The living space is spacious and the décor professionally decorated in white and pastel colors, creating a “clean” feminine romantic atmosphere. Her clothing is expensive, her make-up is subtle and her short blonde hair is styled by a coiffeur. The heroine, Jan, is young, attractive, and motivated by romance as pointed out in the study by Stephen P. Powers, David J. Rothman and Stanley Rothman. Moreover, Paula Marantz Cohen’s point that romantic comedies “glorify material things and make them an expression and an extension of the self” (79) is evident in this opening scene, making “material things” appealing to men and women, but more so to the “female gaze.” Also, the tone of the song is hopeful and confident, while the mood aroused in the viewer is light-hearted and cheerful.

The audience learns that party lines are common in 1959 New York City, which is

a big problem for Jan as seen in the split screen: In the middle screen, Jan is in her bedroom dressed in a light blue silk lace-trimmed nightgown with matching slip-on-heels, and she is wearing a watch and earrings when she attempts to make a work-related phone call on her bedroom phone. On the screen to Jan's left is Eileen, an aphrodisiac brunette in her elegant pastel decorated bedroom, dressed in a pink silk peignoir, reclining on a chaise longue. She is on the phone with Brad Allen, the man with whom Jan shares the party line. Brad is on the screen to Jan's right. He is in his spacious, masculine appointed apartment, seated at his piano with a cigarette and coffee. Eileen intimately and with great feeling says, "Brad. Brad darling, I love you. I just had to call you." Brad, gentle and understanding, says, "I know you do." Then Eileen says, "I'll never forget last night. Especially since you sang me your new song." Brad says, "Our song, Eileen. I wrote it for you." The audience listening to the conversation between Brad and Eileen knows the language is unrealistic or romanticized. The split screen suggests to the audience that Jan is driving a wedge between Brad and his girlfriend; therefore, predicting that Jan and Brad will end up a couple. Clearly the "material things" in this scene again appeals to men and women, but more so to the "female gaze," and in combination with dialogue serves to showcase character (Cohen 79; 85-87). Furthermore, the tone of the dialogue between Brad and Eileen is flirty and hopeful, and the viewer can feel the dreamy mood of the scene.

Eileen is pursuing Brad. Brad does not call her. She calls him, tells him she is in love with him, but he does not reciprocate his love for her. Her aggressiveness to win Brad's heart is opposite to the pursuit plot quest where the hero seeks to win the heroine's heart. Thus, the audience knows that Eileen is not the heroine.

Brad is quite the calculating playboy; he plays into Eileen's emotions when he honors her request to hear the song "You are my inspiration." But Jan interrupts and asks Brad to PLEASE hang up, so she can make an important call, telling him he has been on the phone a half hour. Here Jan is assertive with playboy Brad, which is contrary to how women behave in a patriarchal society. Of course, Eileen asks who is interrupting their conversation, because she wants Brad for herself. Her pursuit of Brad suggests that she will succumb to his seduction without marriage. When Brad informs Eileen the other half of his party line interrupted their conversation, the audience knows Brad's tone is disrespectful to Jan even though he is taking advantage of the party line for what he considers "important" if he wants sex. In fact, Brad not only shows a lack of respect for Jan but also for Eileen who he ultimately wants to bed, which is the male gaze for men who are anti-marriage. The female gaze is that Brad's wants and/or needs take precedent over Jan's wants and/or needs, which happen to be more legitimate since she uses the phone for work. The hierarchy of knowledge here is that Brad knows more than Eileen and Yvette, and the audience knows more about Brad's thoughts. Furthermore, the dialogue between Jan and Brad is realistic, but between Brad and his girlfriend, Eileen, it is unrealistic or romanticized. The "beauty-and-goodness" stereotype as noted by social psychologists Steven Smith, William McIntosh, and Doris Bazzzini is not supported with Brad's girlfriend. She is beautiful, but not morally good because she is willing to have sex with Brad before marriage. Indeed Jan's tone is impatient and assertive; Eileen's tone is insecure. And the mood we feel is related to Brad being insidious and hostile, making us vicariously relate to Jan's dilemma. Moreover, we are bearing witness to what film scholar Deleyto says is essential to the romantic comedy—a narrative about love, gender,

and sexual relationships (Grindon 82-83).

Brad's wolfish ways wear on Jan's patience when she tries using the phone after she gives Brad time to end his conversation with Eileen. However, Eileen is substituted with Yvette. The audience can see that she is a brunette French woman reclining on a chaise in her posh bedroom, telling Brad she wants to see him tonight, but he tells her he has to write six songs for a new show. She offers to come over to his apartment to make him dinner. He accepts. Then Yvette asks Brad to sing a little of "our" song, which is the same song he sang to Eileen, but he sings it in French and changes Eileen's name to Yvette's. Clearly, Eileen and Yvette use their femininity and sexiness to pursue Brad. They appear to give in to their sexual desires hoping Brad will give up his bachelor freedom for marriage, but the audience knows Brad is not interested in settling down. The dialogue between Brad and his girlfriend, Yvette, is unrealistic or romanticized, and the "beauty-and-goodness" stereotype is not supported with Brad's girlfriend who is beautiful, but not morally good because she is willing to have sex with Brad before marriage. Naturally Jan is annoyed and we can sense the indignation she feels toward Brad. Yvette, like Eileen, adores Brad and is flirty. Obviously, we feel empathy for Jan, indignation for Brad, and disappointment that Brad's girlfriends lack moral rectitude; therefore, representing a gender anomaly which is not characteristic of romantic comedies. According to Leger Grindon, a professor of Film and Media Culture, the romantic comedy genre supports traditional practices of courtship, gender relations, and sexual intimacy, or a conservative relationship to social values (83).

The party line feud between Brad and Jan continues with Yvette, but this time Brad gets nasty when he tells Jan she is always listening in order to brighten up her drab

empty life. Jan tells Brad her life would not be drab if she could get a call in once in a while. When the "realistic" conversation ends between Jan and Brad, Jan is storming out of the apartment dressed in a black mink coat, hat, and muffler. The female gaze is that Jan will not tolerate Brad's impudent behavior. Her desires are more important than his. In other words, a career takes precedence over romance when sharing a party line. Moreover, as the audience can recall from Scene One, Jan is the "good" career driven girl who wants marriage before sex when she sings about "the boy she will marry someday, somehow, someway, sometime." Because Jan is not pursing Brad, the prediction is Brad will be "the boy" she will marry. Also, the "beauty-and-goodness" is supported by Jan, for she is not only beautiful, but also morally good. Clearly, Jan's tone is decisively outraged with Brad's disrespectful behavior. And as viewers, we are infuriated with Brad's insolent behavior toward Jan.

When the elevator opens, out comes Jan's housekeeper, Alma, who is suffering from a hangover. The uniformed elevator operator, Harry, cannot comprehend why Alma has to get stoned every day. Jan tells him, "Maybe she has a party line." As Alma is walking to Jan's apartment, she reminds her that the laundry man is coming, the cupboards need to be tidy and she needs to call her office about being late. The audience can see that Alma's hangover and behavior make comedy out of her misery. Even though Alma's tone is indifferent to her housekeeping responsibilities and she is miserable from the hangover, we are humored, which establishes a benevolent perspective as noted by Deleyto (Grindon 82-83).

Alma and Harry are Caucasian, but opposites compared to Jan, Brad, and Brad's girlfriends. Their social class, age, education, and work depict them as characters that

serve the likes of financially independent, well dressed, educated, professional and young urban dwellers in Manhattan, making the city a guarantee for a successful love story (Jerymn 10).

Jan takes action against Brad's abuse of the party line they share, which shows that she is taking charge of her problem. The audience sees Jan leave her apartment for the phone company located in a Manhattan high-rise, hoping Mr. Conrad, the assistant manager, will get her a private phone line after she explains that Brad Allen is a sex maniac because he is always on the phone with one girlfriend after another and she cannot make work related calls. However, Mr. Conrad informs her that her need for a private party line is not a priority unless of course she is pregnant, but since Brad's conduct with many women is bothering her, he will send over an inspector to Mr. Allen's apartment to verify Jan's allegations against him and possibly disconnect him. Jan's assertiveness, articulation, and professional appearance get her action by the phone company, which confirms that her behavior does not support the traditional role of women in this time period. Moreover, the audience sees that Jan is not being made fun of, for her emotional frustration with Brad Allen's behavior makes viewer's care more about her than him. Thus, Jan's desire for the private party line takes precedent, so the female point of view is depicted. Jan's tone is serious and desperate. Viewers can feel her irritation and frustration to take charge of her problem with Brad's abuse of the party line they share.

The audience knows Jan is not at work because she went to see Mr. Conrad about a private phone line. Apparently, Alma never called her boss, Mr. Pierot, owner of Pierot Interiors. As a result, he is going crazy with Jan's rich client, Mrs. Walters, who is

handling a priceless Ming dynasty vase. After Mrs. Walters asks what is it, and Mr. Pierot tells her it's a fourteenth century crematory urn, she then asks if anybody is in it. Mrs. Walters' dialogue with Mr. Pierot shows that this wealthy woman is self-centered and comically stupid when she thinks the priceless urn can be wired for a lamp. Mr. Pierot's tone toward Mrs. Walters is incredulous and derisive. As viewers, the amusement we feel supports Deleyto's point that humor establishes a benevolent perspective in romantic comedy (Grindon 82-83).

The narrative tropes in Scene Three are Jan rejecting Jonathan's generous sports car gift; Jonathan's interaction with the police officer; Mrs. Walters' shopping experience at Pierot Interiors with Jan and Mr. Pierot; Jan's action toward lover boy.

Scene Three has an interior and exterior setting. In Manhattan, outside Pierot's Interiors, Jan hears someone call her name. As she is about to enter the shop, it is her client, Jonathan, calling from a silver, red leather interior sports car. He tells her he tried calling her but her phone was busy. She says, "Naturally." The audience and Jan know why the phone was busy. When Jonathan asks how she likes the car, which he just got out of the showroom, Jan says it is marvelous, just beautiful. Then Jonathan tells her it is hers in grateful appreciation for doing a brilliant job with his office. She says, "What? Jonathan, you just don't go around giving girls cars." Jonathan says, "I do." The audience can see that Jan and Jonathan have a friendly and respectful work relationship from their eye contact and body language, but Jonathan wants more than a work relationship. He is trying to use materialism, his wealth, and professional success to win Jan's affection. However, Jan cannot accept the car because she says it is too personal. This is not a lucky day for Jonathan because Jan is not romantically swayed by his generosity, even when he

offers the car a third time. The audience knows romantic courtship is on Jonathan's mind, but not on Jan's. The luxury sports car is like Jonathan, a symbol of material wealth and professional success. Jonathan's conversation with Jan showcases his character as "being present and artful in every choice regarding the self" (Cohen 85-87). His tone is admiring and appreciative, yet pretentious and deceitful. We can feel Jonathan's effort to win Jan is futile.

When Jan enters Pierot's, Jonathan is receiving a ticket from a police officer for parking the sports car illegally. The comedy between the two men comes when both admit to seeing analysts. Only the audience knows the officer and Jonathan see an analyst. Obviously, they both have personal problems to get therapy. Moreover, the officer is a new story character, but much like Alma, Harry, and Mr. Conrad, he is not from the same social class as the stock characters. The comical conversation is meant to amuse the viewer, which not only showcases Jonathan and police officer's characters, but also gives the comedy a "benevolent perspective" (Grindon 82-83).

Inside Pierot's Interiors, Jan apologizes to Mrs. Walters for being late and leaving her with her boss. However, Mrs. Walters feels she had a "fruitful" morning with Mr. Pierot, showing Jan what she picked out. When Jan tells her it is a fertility goddess and it is the last thing she needs in Scarsdale, Mrs. Walters says, "Oh dear, I had no idea." This conversation establishes Jan as a professional, for Mrs. Walters takes Jan's advice. Once again, Mrs. Walters is comically stupid, which is why Mr. Pierot does not like working with someone who has "the taste of a water buffalo." But he admits to Jan he does business with her because she is "a very rich buffalo." Jan and the audience know Mr. Pierot has to keep his disdain for Mrs. Walters to himself, so when Mrs. Walters invites

them to her housewarming party, Pierot has to accept much to his chagrin. And to insure that Jan works exclusively with Mrs. Walters, Mr. Pierot asks why he couldn't reach her all morning. When he learns that Jan reported lover boy to the phone company and they are sending out an inspector to his apartment, so he gets what he deserves, the audience knows that Jan asked Alma to call and let Mr. Pierot know that she would be late. Obviously, Jan, as a professional decorator, is respectful to her boss and her client, but she has no control over Alma and her hangover. Alma, unlike Jan, is not mindful of her job responsibilities under the influence of alcohol, and the audience and stock characters are not privy to her personal problems. The dialogue delivered by Jan is direct and confident, while Mrs. Walter's is accepting and Mr. Pierot's is scornful. We admire Jan's finesse handling Mrs. Walters and Mr. Pierot, which does not support traditional gender roles and a patriarchal ideology.

In this scene, Jan makes it clear to Jonathan that accepting a car is out of the realm of her professional decorating duties. Even though the audience understands the male point of view, which is Jonathan winning Jan, the female point of view is Jan resisting Jonathan because she chooses work over romance and does not want to be pursued. Thus, Jonathan is being set up as the prick foil, a romantic rival. Film scholar, Mark Rubinfeld, makes a good point noting that the relationship that most counts in the prick foil is the relationship between the hero and the heroine, not the relationship between the hero and the prick foil. Moreover, the prick foil's ideological function is to help out the hero by ensuring the success of the pursuit plot. In fact, Jan's resistance to Jonathan is a portent that Brad Allen will be the hero. We are beginning to see that speech not only defines the characters but it also moves the plot.

Scene Four's narrative tropes are Brad Allen's encounter with Miss Dickinson, the telephone company inspector; the telephone company's decision regarding Jan's complaint against Mr. Allen; Jan and Brad's diatribe regarding the party line; Alma's eavesdropping on Brad and her consensus with Brad about Jan's lifestyle; Jonathan's marriage proposal to Jan.

Scene Four has an interior setting, Brad Allen's masculine and well-appointed living room; Jan's building's elevator and elegant apartment. Brad answers his door to find the telephone inspector is a young attractive business-like female, Miss Dickinson. His charismatic charm and smooth talk shows the audience that he knows how to romance women; therefore, male viewers can learn how to get a girl. Watching Miss Dickinson's eyes penetrate Allen's causes her to hesitate identifying herself and her business. Specifically, when Brad asks what she would like to inspect, Miss Dickinson says, "You. I mean we received a complaint about you." Brad's persona gets him what he wants, so viewers will predict that Miss Dickinson will give Mr. Allen a free pass. The female gaze is that women like Miss Dickinson are vulnerable to calculating playboys, so boy gets girl, not girl gets boy. Moreover, Miss Dickinson's reaction to Brad is comical and conciliatory, while Brad's reaction to Miss Dickinson is respectful and welcoming. The scene is a testament to Brad's ability to enthrall a woman with his smooth talk and charm.

Alma's hangover is comical when she steps out of the elevator with the comment that Harry doesn't have to break the sound barrier. Under her breath she calls him a hot-rodder before entering Jan's apartment. When Jan tells her she heard from the phone company, Alma is more interested in treating her hangover than listening to Jan because

she can't focus until ten o'clock. Obviously, the female gaze is that Alma is dysfunctional while Jan is functional. Like Jonathan, Alma seems to need an analyst to cope with personal problems. Perhaps being a domestic is boring, repetitive work and reason to drink every day. Jan dismisses Alma's attitude, and persists in telling her that the phone company inspector, Miss Dickinson, found Mr. Allen cooperative, so the complaint was unwarranted. As the audience would predict, Brad is given a pass because Jan knows him and as she put it, "Sending a woman inspector is like sending a marshmallow to put out a fire." The female gaze is that some women let their emotions interfere with their sense of morality. It takes a clever, righteous, and confident woman to uncover the ulterior motive of men who use women for their personal gain. Jan's tone is straightforward and contemptuous of Brad while Alma's is indifferent and unconcerned as she is coping with her hangover. Jan chooses to accept Alma's daily condition, for she neither chastises her nor offers her supporting advice. We sense Jan's frustration and resignation to her party line problem.

The phone rings and it is Mr. Allen. He tells Jan that the phone company gave a code number for their line and he wants her to call him personally. Jan sarcastically replies, "If I hadn't complained, the inspector wouldn't have found out how friendly you are." Brad says, "Miss Morrow, why do my personal affairs interest you?" The diatribe continues with Brad saying that Jan doesn't like living alone and she is taking her bedroom problems out on him. Brad's implication is that she is not getting sex. But Jan snaps back defensively telling him she likes living alone, she has no bedroom problems, nothing bothers her and she wants an adult solution such as working out some schedule where she can make her business calls and he can make "whatever you call them." Since

they have to share the party line for another month, she inadvertently says, “We have to try living with one another.” Realizing what she said, she waits for Brad to make an off color remark, but he doesn’t. Instead, he says, “Is that all you have on your mind, Sex?” The audience can see Jan’s serious facial expression as she speaks with Brad, and Brad’s smile when he speaks with her. Furious, she tells Brad in a high-pitched voice never mind about her mind, and she slams down the phone. The audience sees Brad smile, knowing he provoked Jan, especially after agreeing to the phone schedule. This back and forth bickering seems to be what happens between a husband and a wife, which for the male gaze is why some men are anti-marriage. As for the female gaze, Jan represents an assertive woman who will not accept Brad’s insolent and disrespectful behavior. Jan is the antithesis of the traditional gender role of women in this time period. The tone of the diatribe between Jan and Brad is belligerent, making us empathize with Jan’s point of view regarding a resolution to sharing the party line. The dialogue continues to showcase character and a realistic conflict reflecting gender relations.

Alma is smiling while she is eavesdropping on Jan and Brad’s conversation. When Alma tells Jan Brad makes sense, Jan is incensed, placing her arms on her waist. After admitting she has been listening, Jan asks Alma, “Have you no shame?” She says no, explaining that he has improved many a dreary afternoon. Alma’s remark supports the possibility that one reason for drinking every day is because her job is boring. Moreover, it points out that Alma’s eavesdropping is not condoned by Jan, who has ethical standards, which are in opposition to Alma’s. And when Jan asks her what did Brad say that made good sense, Alma says, “Admitting you like living alone.” Jan says, “What is missing in my life?” She feels a good job, a lovely apartment, and going out

with nice men means nothing is missing in her life. However, Alma's comeback is that she shouldn't ask what is missing in life, because then she is missing it. Alma's implying Jan is missing being in love and making love with a man. Jan's sexual innocence is further confirmed when she asks Alma, "What is a girl to do? Ask the first man she meets to come home with her?" Viewers know by the conversation between Jan and Alma that Jan is a virgin who believes marriage comes before sex and with a man who wins your heart. Jan walks away from Alma sarcastically repeating "bedroom problems" three times on the way to her bedroom and while she is looking into her bedroom mirror. Her facial expression shows she is contemplating those "bedroom problems." Clearly, Jan represents the "beauty-and-goodness" stereotype in her conversation with Alma, by pointing out her standards regarding eavesdropping and premarital sex, which supports traditional gender roles and family values. Jan's tone is earnest and serious. And through Jan's introspection, we feel her frustration and uncertainty.

Besides dialogue revealing Jan's virginity, her apartment décor, which is feminine, pastel colored and quite white seems to be a metaphor for sexual innocence or virginity. In fact, when Jan contemplates what Brad suggested about "bedroom problems" missing in her life, the "good" girl, not the sexually available one, does not give into her desires, which assures audiences that sex after marriage supports traditional family values. On the other hand, Brad's apartment décor is warm with earth tone colors and abstract artwork suggesting that his lair is seductive. The male gaze is that seduction of women can be achieved if you create an apartment ambience like Brad's. Obviously, the characters' material things are an expression of the self with Jan depicting "beauty-and-goodness" and Brad depicting "beauty-and-moral corruption."

Jan and Jonathan are in Jonathan's newly decorated office. Jan, dressed in a white dress and red hat, wants to know how Jonathan likes the abstract painting being hung. The audience knows from Scene Three, when Jonathan bought Jan the sports car she wouldn't accept, she only wants a work relationship with him. Perhaps if Jonathan learned how to romance a woman like Brad, she could love him. Just like Jonathan is straightforward about loving and wanting to marry her, Jan is straightforward telling him she does not love him. It's comical to hear and watch Jonathan persist at winning Jan's heart, especially when he tells her she should marry him, because he is young, rich, healthy, and very good-looking and he has everything. But Jan is persistent in telling him again that she does not love him. When he asks her how does she know that, and says, "Love isn't an opinion, it's a chemical reaction. We never kissed." They kiss, but Jan doesn't "hit the moon." She tells him she wants to hit the moon, so he says, "They didn't hit the moon with the first shot either." The prediction is that she will hit the moon with Brad Allen because he knows how to romance a woman. Jonathan, refusing to give up on Jan, asks her out to dinner, but she declines for a client's housewarming. Then he tells her he will call her tomorrow, but she tells him to call between the half-hour and hour since she arranged a cease-fire with her party line. For a third time Jonathan asks to marry her with the promise that he will smother her with private lines. Jan's ending words are, "I better leave. That could sweep a girl off her feet." Clearly, Jonathan's persistence has a negative effect on Jan. His conversational tone with Jan is affectionate, candid, pretentious, but not romantic. Jan's tone with Jonathan is straightforward, earnest, and objective, making us feel Jonathan's rejection and futility in pursuing Jan. In fact, Jonathan's lack of romantic moves and Jan's unrealistic language fulfills the comedic

benevolent perspective characteristic of the romantic comedy put forth by Deleyto.

Jonathan has strong self-esteem when he tells Jan in a sweet manner that he is young, rich, healthy, very good-looking and he has everything, but the audience knows he does not have Jan, because she did not "hit the moon" when they kissed. The female gaze delivered by Jan is to find a man who makes her "hit the moon." Moreover, Jonathan doesn't know how to romance a woman. He is straightforward about his desires and leaves nothing to a woman's imagination.

The male gaze delivered by Jonathan is that a man can sweep a woman off her feet with time. It is unrealistic to assume that all women will "hit the moon" with the first kiss. Perhaps if Jonathan knew that romance is not telling, but showing, he would not be divorced three times. Since he desires to win Jan's heart and she is not reciprocating, Jonathan is being set up as the prick foil in the pursuit plot and he will get whipped. He will not be the hero in this love story because the heroine, Jan, is resisting his love. Moreover, the abstract artwork in Jonathan's office may imply that Jonathan is a troubled man since he encounters resistance from Jan, who he believes will be the "good wife" unlike the previous wives he has married. Actually the dialogue is defining the characters and moving the plot forward.

The narrative tropes in Scene Five are Jan and Brad arguing over the phone schedule; Jonathan and Brad's relationship; Jonathan and Brad's opinion about marriage; Jan's refusal to accept Brad's apology for phone abuse and rudeness; Brad romancing Marie.

Scene Five has an interior setting, Jan's apartment and Brad's apartment. Back at her apartment, Jan asks Alma if she had any calls. Eavesdropping on the phone and

smiling, Alma tells her it's him. Immediately, Jan takes the phone and tells Mr. Allen that he is on her half-hour. Alma calls her a party pooper and exits the apartment. Seconds later the phone rings. When Jan picks up, Brad, with controlled anger, tells her never to do that again. Jan reminds him they had an agreement and he was on her time. Brad says, "So I overlapped by a few messily minutes. What can I do when someone calls me? Be as rude as you?" Jan says, "Do you have anything else to say?" Brad lets Jan know that she is on his back and needs to stop living vicariously in what she thinks he does. The female gaze is that Jan is right to tell Brad he is not sticking to the phone schedule. His disrespectful reaction to Jan's call is exacerbating their dislike for each other, which will probably result in consequences that the viewers do not know yet. Moreover, Jan's aggravated tone and Brad's controlled hostility makes us feel their disdain for each other. Jan's demeanor is contrary to a traditional gender role.

Brad is in the bathroom when the doorbell rings, but he knows it's Jonathan, his friend and financer for the new Broadway show Brad is commissioned to write songs. Jonathan says, "Hi Brad, any more songs ready?" Brad says, "Almost." Jonathan says, "Fine. Let's hear them." Because Brad is in a hurry he says, no, and Jonathan, not wanting to anger Brad, says okay, but reminds him that he is putting up $200,000 for the show and they have a theater deadline to meet. Jonathan laments that money seems to have lost its value these day because it doesn't frighten songwriters.

The female gaze is that Brad and Jonathan have opposite mindsets regarding commitments. The viewers know and Jonathan knows that womanizing is more of a priority with Brad than writing the songs for a theater deadline. But Jonathan does not insinuate this idea. Even though Jonathan is upset, he takes a different tack so he doesn't

anger his close friend by telling him he is prejudiced against him because he is part of a minority group. When Brad asks, “What minority group?” Jonathan says, “Millionaires. . . . And we’ve got the money to do it.” Brad picks up on his bitterness while Jonathan speaks from the heart how they went to college together, but he doesn’t feel successful, saying the eight million dollars he had going to college is the same amount now; therefore, Jonathan seems jealous of Brad who is successful because he worked his way through college to be an important songwriter with some Broadway hits.

Even though Brad and Jonathan come from different backgrounds, the viewers are aware that their solid friendship developed over the years if they are involved with the Broadway show and Brad knows Jonathan’s moods when it’s girl trouble. While Jonathan’s tone is controlled anger and jealousy, Brad’s is unconcerned and apathetic. We can’t help feeling sympathetic for Jonathan. Clearly, their dialogue is defining their characters.

“Who’s the girl?” Jonathan says, “What girl?” After Brad tells him he has been through three marriages with him and he only gets ambitious when he’s ready to climb into the ring, Jonathan admits it’s a girl—the sweetest, loveliest, and most talented person he has met. Brad sarcastically asks, “When’s the happy occasion?” Jonathan is unsure because she claims she does not want to marry him, but all his wives made the same claim. When Jonathan asks to call her up, Brad says, yes, but he wants to know her name. He tells him Jan, but Brad wants to know her full name suspecting it is Jan with whom he shares the party line. Of course Jonathan refuses to reveal her full name, because he doesn’t trust Brad knowing he has a stellar record with every woman. When Jonathan tries calling Jan and her phone is busy, he mentions that she shares a party line

with some nut with a phone fetish and she had to make a deal with him to use the phone on alternate half-hours. Clearly, the audience knows Jonathan does not know Brad knows Jan. Feeling confident that Jan is safe from Brad, Jonathan answers Brad's questions about Jan's attractiveness and figure with a smile and ecstatically rolling eyes. When Brad presses him for her name, Jonathan smugly shakes his head, no, and tells Brad, "I found this goldmine. I'm not telling an old claim-jumper who she is." Instead, Jonathan offers his "old friend" advice:

> As a friend, I only hope one day you find a girl like this. You should quit chasing around, get married. . . . You're not getting younger, fella. Sure, it's fun; it's exciting dancing with a different doll every night. But a man has to give it up sometime … [b]ecause you want to create a stable, lasting relationship with one person. There's nothing so wonderful, so fulfilling, as coming home to the same woman every night. Because that is what an adult does. A mature man wants responsibilities—a wife, a family, a house. . . . You can find arguments for everything, so why are you against marriage? (*Pillow Talk*)

Cynical Jonathan reassures Brad that marriage is a worthy endeavor for a mature man. Thus, his point of view supports traditional family values. And we feel his optimistic attitude regarding marriage.

Brad remarks:

> Before marriage, a man is like a tree in the forest. He stands there independent, an entity on to himself. Then he's cut down, his branches cut off, and he's stripped of his bark and thrown into the river with the rest of the logs. Then this tree is taken to the mill. And when it comes out, it's no longer a tree. It's the vanity table, the

breakfast nook, the baby crib and the newspaper that lines the family garbage can. (*Pillow Talk*)

Jonathan says he would agree with Brad if Jan weren't extra special, explaining that with Jan you look forward to having your branches cut off. Thus, Jonathan and Brad demonstrate opposite ideas about marriage, and we feel Brad's pessimism and apprehensive attitude toward matrimony.

Jonathan's character depicts the male gaze, which is the theme of social regeneration through coupling and a patriarchal ideology put forth by film scholar Mark Rubinfeld. For example, Jonathan wants to marry Jan even though he has been married three times, because "she is extra special and there is something wonderful, so fulfilling, as coming home to the same woman every night." Males need females, and in a patriarchal society females recognize that what matters most are men, marriage, and motherhood. The female gaze is to agree with Jonathan on the virtues of marriage. On the other hand, Brad's character represents a different male gaze, which is anti-marriage. Even though Brad's anti-marriage speech does not support the theme of social regeneration through coupling and a patriarchal society, the prediction from the action of the plot is that playboy, Brad, will get married by the end of the film to make up for his outspoken rant against marriage, especially since Jonathan is the prick foil and he cannot win Jan no matter how hard he tries. This scene affirms that Jan is the spectacle, which means she is not moving the plot forward. Instead, the male gaze is moving the plot forward as noted by Laura Mulvey. Moreover, we are aware that the narrative is about love, gender, and sexual relationships, a romantic comedy characteristic purported by Deleyto.

After Jonathan leaves, Brad reflects on what has transpired between them and seems to be contrite when he calls Jan to apologize for the way he acted and confesses that he has used the phone too much, and he's been extremely rude. His voice is oozing with charm, but Jan looks into the phone suspiciously as the audience can see from the split screen. When he asks Jan to get some coffee together, because he thinks they probably have a lot in common, Jan, for the first time, strikes back at Brad when she says, "Mr. Allen, we have nothing in common. Not that meeting you might prove amusing. But some jokes are just too obvious to be funny." Jan's tone is harsh and sardonic toward Brad, making us feel her cynicism and empowerment.

The split screen shows the audience that Jan slams the phone down on a very surprised Brad. She is not passive toward Brad, making clear to him that she has no interest in reconciliation. Brad has no chance of romancing Jan. The guy is not getting the girl, especially since we know he is a deceitful character.

Brad and Marie, a beautiful southern girl, are in Brad's apartment. The lights are dim. Marie is wearing a blue silk cocktail dress and she is holding a martini glass in one hand when she says, "Bradley, honey." Without looking up, Brad holds his hand up for her not to bother him at this crucial moment. When he says, "I've almost got it. There." Marie is thrilled and says, "I can't believe it. A song for little old me."

The audience knows Marie's song is the same song Brad sang to his girlfriends, Eileen and Yvette. Moreover, it is comical to see Marie visibly melt as she looks at Brad with adoring eyes and places her arms around his shoulders, and to hear her speak, "I can't believe it. A song for little old me." The viewers are aware that Marie is one of many girls Brad romances, because he is not ready to commit to marriage and assume a

mature adult's responsibilities. Marie does not depict the "beauty-and-goodness" stereotype; she is spectacle, and her speech is not realistic.

The narrative tropes in Scene Six are Jan leaving the Walters' housewarming; the escapade between Jan and Tony; Brad discovering and falling for Jan Morrow in the Copa del Rio.

Scene Six has an interior and exterior setting. Jan and Mrs. Walters are dressed in expensive evening gowns, white and black respectively. The men are dressed in expensive dark suits. The scene opens with Jan and Mrs. Walters in the Walters' entry hall. The housewarming party is over and Mrs. Walter's is disappointed that Jan is leaving so soon, but Jan explains she has an early appointment in the morning. When Mrs. Walters tells Jan that everyone thinks the house is heaven, Jan says, "Oh, I'm so glad."

Mrs. Walters is high society. The point of the housewarming is to show off the new décor, which receives kudos from guests, establishing Jan's incredible interior design talent, which confirms Jonathan's opinion of Jan as a decorator in Scene three. In 1959, interior decorators were considered professionals. Perhaps because of male decorators in the profession, women interior decorators with talent were treated equally. As we recall from Scene Three, Mr. Pierot was upset when Jan came in late and he had to work with Mrs. Walters. And also, in Scene Three, Jonathan wants to give Jan a sports car for the excellent job decorating his office. Furthermore, Mrs. Walters' laudatory tone, compliments Jan's elated reaction to the praise.

Just as Jan is ready to leave the Walters' home, Tony Walters enters the front door. He is a clean-cut looking twenty-one-year-old college boy, wearing a suit, and he

has a crew cut. He asks his mom how the party is going. After she replies “lovely,” Mrs. Walters takes Tony by the hand and introduces him to Jan, proudly telling Jan that Tony is graduating Harvard this summer, and he is a Phi Beta Kappa. Tony is modest about his academic achievements, but his mom is not. When Mrs. Walters tells Jan that Tony will take her home, Jan does not want to impose, but accepts with a thank you. The viewer’s first impression of Tony is that of a refined, intelligent, gentleman. However, that impression changes when Tony takes Jan home in his light yellow late model MG convertible. Tony’s fast driving is a portent of his character changing from a gentleman to a lecherous twenty-one-year old college student. Ultimately, we know Jan’s gracious tone will be transformed to something negative.

In Brad’s apartment, Brad is romancing Marie. He asks, “When do you have to be at the Copa for the next show?” Marie replies, “Don’t worry, darling. We’ve got oodles of time.” Sitting next her on the couch and kissing, Brad confirms his ulterior motive with the women he romances when he flips a switch and the lamps by the couch go out, the record changer drops a record into playing position, and the latch on the door snaps shut, and they kiss and embrace. It’s comical to watch his moves on Marie and their romanticized discourse, which is unrealistic while the humor establishes a benevolent perspective and the space frees the characters from inhibitions so they can explore their desires, as noted by Deleyto.

Tony parks the MG on a dark street and desperately tries to kiss Jan. His uncouth behavior is comical as viewers watch Jan place her hands against his chest to push him away. When she tells him to control himself and reminds him that he is a Harvard man, Tony tells her, “Not tonight, baby. I’m on vacation. I dig older women.” He seems to

have multiple arms around Jan forcing her to tell him to stop or she will tell his mother. Her words only provoke Tony to say, “It’s your word against mine.” Furious with his behavior, she threatens to belt the Phi Beta Kappa, so he changes his tack and promises to take her home if she would have one drink with him. Jan agrees, ending this wrestling match to get off the deserted road. The audience sees Tony’s sly smile knowing he has a plan in mind. They also know when Jan lets her breath out, she has had a hard day first with Brad, and now Tony. The female gaze is that a wolfish man does not get an extra special woman like Jan—sweet, talented, and lovely. Moreover, Jan’s assertive behavior shows she is in control of the situation in spite of being exasperated by Tony’s crude moves.

The Copa del Rio Club is fairly crowded, dimly lit, and very expensive. A number of couples dance to a small Latin combo when Brad and Marie are escorted over to a booth near the dance floor. As Marie and Brad sit down, the audience sees that Jan and Tony are sitting in the next booth. Brad and Jan sit back to back so they do not see each other. Tony is inebriated so he points to Jan’s half-filled glass encouraging her to drink up. Jan reminds him that his mother is going to be worried if he doesn’t get home, so she wants to put him in a cab. However, he tells Jan she is uncooperative and again encourages her to finish her drink, saying it’s nourishing. Irritated, Jan tells Tony to stop trying to get her drunk. Tony draws himself up to what he thinks is a dignified pose and says, “I’ll have you know a Harvard man never resorts to getting a woman drunk, except in an emergency. And you, Miss Morrow, are an emergency.” Brad reacts to the name Jan Morrow, looking at Tony and Jan’s back. When Jan tells Tony to get the check, and Tony refuses, she says, “You can stay till AA comes for you. I’m leaving.” Tony says,

"No, wait. Just one dance, I promise." Again Jan is assertive with Tony and she seems to be thinking this young man is primitive and a sharp contrast to the nice men she dates. Obviously, Brad knows that he shares the party line with Jan Morrow who does not know him. We can feel Brad's interest in Jan and Jan's embarrassing dilemma with Tony.

Brad sits entranced watching Jan and Tony on the dance floor. Instead of paying attention to Marie, he is watching Jan's hips slowly swing back and forth to the sensuous strains of a Mambo. As Jan executes a turn in the dance, she looks directly at Brad. Brad smiles at her and the audience hears his thoughts. "So that's the other end of my party line. How do I get on friendly terms with that?" Brad and the audience know what Jan doesn't know, which is that he shares the party line with her. Unlike Brad's other girlfriends who are eager to please Brad sexually, viewers know he is thinking Jan will be a challenge and her white gown is a symbol of her virginity and morality. Clearly, we experience Brad's contemplative and determined mood.

Brad's date, Marie, senses that Brad is preoccupied. Marie asks him if anything is wrong. When Brad says, no, twice, and asks if she should be getting changed for the show, the audience knows he wants to get rid of Marie, so he can contemplate his untenable position. After Marie leaves, the audience hears Brad's thoughts. He knows he is "buck-dead" if she knows who he is, so he decides not to tell her. The male gaze is that Brad is attracted to Jan and he wants to romance her for sex, but he will have to lie about his identity. Obviously, suspense is adding to the film's humor.

The narrative tropes in Scene Seven are Brad coming to Jan's aid when Tony passes out on the dance floor; Brad masquerading as Rex Stetson to win Jan's attention; Brad's transformation; Jan's attraction to Brad.

Scene Seven has an interior and exterior setting. In the elegant and expensive Copa del Rio, Brad is masquerading as Rex to get Jan's attention because she despises Brad Allen, so when inebriated Tony sinks to the floor and passes out, Brad is on his feet crossing to Jan and speaking in a gentle, western drawl says, "Excuse me, ma'am. I reckon it got a mite too close for your partner." Jan's eye contact shows she is instantly attracted to Brad because he is smiling and a gentleman.

When Jan asks Brad if he could ask a few waiters to help get Tony outside, Brad says, "Why shucks. No need to call anybody else." Brad puts Tony over his shoulder and introduces himself as Mr. Stetson, Rex Stetson, and comments to Jan, "We have a saying in Texas, ma'am: never drink anything stronger than you are. Or older." Jan's expression shows that she is contemplating his saying. Because Rex thinks Tony is her boyfriend, Jan makes it clear to him that Tony is the son of her client. At first Rex thinks she is a lawyer until Jan tells him she is an interior decorator, and Tony offered to take her home after his mother's housewarming party, but he insisted on stopping for a drink. We know Rex does not know about Tony's lecherous behavior toward Jan in the MG, but Rex has the impression that Tony was trying to force his attentions on her from the conversation he overheard at the table when he piously says, "There is one thing I can't stand, men taking advantage of a woman. We make short work of his kind back in Texas." Nevertheless, the mood is light-hearted even though we know Brad's deceit and Jan's benevolence.

It is humorous to witness the action and hear the conversations between Tony and Jan and Jan and Rex. Viewers are aware of Brad's motive for the masquerade and gentleman-like behavior toward Jan who is unaware of his identity. Here the plot appears

to be moving forward in a linear storytelling manner, which is similar to the male sex act in its insistent forward motion, as noted by film theorist Laura Mulvey (qtd.in Cohen 79).

Outside the Copa, Rex puts Tony in a taxi, and finds out that Jan is taking Tony's MG home. Being that it is late and Jan is alone, Rex wants to see her home. His gentleman concern makes Jan smile and say, "That's very nice of you. Thank you." When Rex sees the car, he comments on its bitty size and the fact that in Texas they have jackrabbits bigger than this car. He opens the car door, she gets in, he closes the door, goes around to the driver's side, opens the door, and he is confronted with a problem. The car is too small for him to get into. It's comical to watch Brad squeeze his body in behind the steering wheel with his leg still outside the car. With extreme effort he crams the leg into the car. When he manages to close the door, he tells her he can steer if she can work the pedals. They decide to call a cab. As noted by Deleyto, comedy establishes a benevolent perspective and with that we experience a playful mood between Jan and Rex.

The vicissitudes of the emotional relationship between Brad as Rex and Jan seem to be apparent as the action of the plot develops (Deleyto qtd. in Grindon 82-83). Thus, we see Jan is falling for Brad and Brad is falling for Jan inside the cab. Looking into Rex's eyes, Jan tells Rex he looked so funny in the MG, and then we hear both their thoughts. Jan is thinking, "What a marvelous-looking man. I wonder if he is single." Rex is thinking, "No idea how long I can get away with this act, but she's worth it." They smile and laugh for different reasons before Jan asks him if he is married. We hear Rex's thoughts, "Uh, Oh." Then Jan's thoughts, "You idiot, trying to scare the man away." Rex casually tells her no, ma'am, but thinks, "This may take some fancy field running," so he decides to compare New York to Texas saying, "All those buildings full of people kind of

scares a country boy like me, you know it?" The audience hears Jan's thoughts, "Isn't that sweet? So unpretentious and honest, and different from a couple of monsters, Tony Walters and Brad Allen. Given Jan and Brad's thoughts, we know they are delighted to be together and this is the beginning of a love story. Moreover, both Jan and Rex fit the "beauty-and-goodness" stereotype.

In the hallway outside Jan's apartment, the elevator door opens and Rex and Jan step out while having a conversation about their families, which shows that they're relaxed with each other, but still getting to know each other. Rex is an only child even though everyone had large families. On the other hand, Jan is one of six—four brothers and two sisters. When she says, "I believe in large families. Don't you?" Rex says, "Yes, indeed, but it seems like folks stopped having kids." Both are smiling when Rex opens the door, and Jan asks him in for coffee. Looking at his watch, he declines and playing the gentleman, he does not even try to kiss her. Instead, he shakes her hand. When he turns and starts off, we hear Jan's thoughts, "Don't let him walk away without your phone number, you goof. You may never see him again." The audience knows Jan is seeking romance with Rex, when she says, "Oh, Mr. Stetson. See'n that you're all alone in New York, if there is anything you need and I can help, my number is Plaza 22748." Rex tells her he can remember that number. Then we hear his thoughts, "Five or six dates ought to do it." Obviously, Brad is still the playboy and anti-marriage. However, the irony here is that Brad tells Jan he is for large families, which at this time period is achieved after marriage. Even though Rex and Jan's conversation and mannerisms are polite and casual, we know from Jan's thoughts that she is eager to get friendly and romantic with Rex, and from his thoughts, we know Rex (Brad) is calculating how long it

will take to get Jan to succumb to a sexual relationship without marriage. But to Rex's credit, he is making Jan consider that self-fulfillment can come through marriage. We are emotionally with Rex and Jan as their transformation frees them to explore their desires (Deleyto).

After Brad leaves her apartment, we see Jan in bed thinking that Brad is a man she can trust because he respects her, but the fact he doesn't kiss her makes her question her attraction to him, especially since he doesn't write her number down. And because she is falling for him, the audience can tell by her facial expressions that she is upset for not asking where he is staying; therefore, Brad's is achieving his quest to win Jan's heart.

On a split screen, Jan and Brad are lying in bed. When Jan's phone rings, she answers and hears Brad say, "Ma'am, this is Rex Stetson. I hope I didn't wake you up." Jan is happy and relieved he called. Rex tells her he was thinking about her generous offer if he needed something and he does. He would enjoy seeing a friendly face for dinner tomorrow night, but if she is busy. . . . Jan quickly responds, "No, I always keep tomorrow open. I mean, I hadn't planned a thing. I'd love to have dinner with you." The audience can feel Jan's heart racing with excitement. The female gaze is girl gets boy.

The male gaze is to get the girl, who Brad hopes for by interfering in the romance between Rex and Jan to take away any suspicion that Brad is Rex. He jiggles the phone receiver button and says, "Hello? Hello? Is someone on the line?" Irritated, Jan says she is on the line and asks Brad to please get off. Brad says all right, but you're on my half-hour. Brad jiggles the receiver as though he has hung up, but Rex says, "Who was that, ma'am?" Jan says, "A horrible man on my line." Rex comments on his ill manners, and tells her he will pick her up 7:30. Then he tells Jan he gets a nice warm feeling being near

her, like being around a pot-bellied stove on a frosty morning. We see Jan smiling and very pleased. After Jan hangs up and Rex's half of the screen blacks out, she stretches contentedly and we hear her thoughts, "Like a pot-bellied stove on a frosty morning. He does like you." The female gaze is girl gets boy. Clearly, the dialogue between Rex and Jan is not realistic, but romanticized as the love story unfolds.

Jan is thinking about Rex when the phone rings again, but this time it is Brad on the other half of the screen. He tells Jan he could not help overhearing part of her conversation and feeling a certain responsibility for her. His advice is not to go out with that man. He's a phony and, "Don't let that yokel act fool you. This ranch-hand Romeo is trying to lure you into the nearest barn." Jan is angry and tells him not to judge other people by himself. The audience can see that Brad is making Jan defend Rex, which is driving her into Rex's arms. Even though it is not any of his business, Brad offers Jan a friendly warning by telling her he knows exactly what he'll do tomorrow. They will go to dinner, then dancing. Then he will find an excuse to stop off at his hotel where the payoff comes. Jan, angry at these insinuations about Rex, coldly says good night to Brad and slams the phone down. Jan does not know that Brad is Rex and Brad's concerned behavior is deceitful, calculating, and morally corrupt for trying to characterize Rex as an unsavory character.

Rex takes Jan to an intimate restaurant where they sit at a table, toast each other, and dance. The audience can see by their eye contact and smiles that Brad knows how to romance a woman. It's obvious that Jan is falling for Rex whose character is opposite Brad's. While Brad is morally corrupt, Rex is morally good. Thus, the "beauty and goodness" stereotype put forth by social psychologists Stephen Smith, William McIntosh

and Doris Bazzini does not apply to all physically attractive individuals in terms of their moral goodness and romantic activity (77).

The audience can predict that Brad's warning to Jan about Rex's plans after dinner will become a reality, but with unknown consequences. Sitting beside Brad in a convertible, we see their smiles and laughter and ease with each other. When they reach the Plaza hotel where Rex is staying, he tells Jan he wants to get his coat, because it is a little bit chilly. A close up shot of Jan shows that she is crushed. We hear her thoughts, "Uh, oh, the pay off." The female gaze is that Rex is just like all the other men who want sex without marriage, which does not support the traditional family values in this time period (Rubinfeld 79).

Rex and Jan enter Rex's hotel room. It's obviously a rented room where Rex moved in a suitcase, and some articles of clothing to give the room an air of authenticity. The audience can see Jan is thinking, "Brad Allen was right. Rex is like all the others, especially when he says, "One thing about New York, nice big hotel rooms and mighty comfortable beds. Come over here." Jan apprehensively crosses over to him, prepared for the worst. But Rex turns to the window, which is near the bed and points as he says, "Now ain't that a pretty view of Central Park? Mighty romantic, ain't it? " Jan acts surprised when he says, "Let's go." The female gaze is that some men are morally good like Rex. And the suspense adds to the film's humor.

Outside the hotel, Rex's car is still parked out front. When he says, "This way, ma'am." Jan says, "I thought we were going for a drive." Rex says, "We are, back home style." Pointing across the street, we can see the horse and buggies lined up outside the entrance to the park. The male gaze is that men need to be unpredictable when romancing

a woman. The female gaze is that women like to be romantically surprised by unpredictability. The unexpected is sexually appealing.

Rex and Jan are in the horse buggy sitting up front in the driver's seat, with Rex at the reins. He tells Jan, "Whenever I want to get close to home, the only thing that helps is getting behind a horse." We hear Jan's thoughts, "There is something wholesome about a man who loves animals." And Rex's thoughts, "I hope this stupid horse knows where to go." Rex's thoughts create suspense for the viewer, which adds to the film's humor. Jan's thoughts confirm her attraction for Rex. Moreover, here is another contrast between Rex and Brad who have different living experiences.

Jan and Rex are at an expensive restaurant near Central Park. Perhaps it's Tavern on the Green. The contrast between Rex and Brad continues with Rex depicting Texas as a homey family place supporting traditional family values (Rubinfeld 79). After dinner, while drinking coffee, Rex takes a cloth napkin and sugar cubes to demonstrate home in Texas and where the ranch house stands, the pony corral, and the mountain behind the ranch house, which he makes by standing a cloth napkin upright, rising to a peak. He explains that the mountain is not huge, but it's ours. Jan smiles and says, "Texas must be a wonderful place." Brad says, "Yes, ma'am it is. It is."

Rex's intimate conversation with Jan at the restaurant is interrupted when he notices Jonathan checking his coat. It is humorous to watch Brad defend his masquerade from Jonathan and Jan, who are unaware that Brad is happily hunting Jan. Realizing that he is in a hell of a spot if Jonathan sees him with Jan, he politely excuses himself to get cigarettes. Urgently, he enters a phone booth and keeps the door open so Jonathan overhears him feigning a conversation with someone named Fred. When Jonathan asks

who Fred is, he learns that Brad needs him to chaperone a family friend so he can work on Jonathan's songs. Brad suggests taking Moose, he means Miss Tagget, dancing, but she can't dance. Brad randomly points out a girl to Jonathan. When he sees the girl is a hundred pounds overweight, Jonathan refuses to help Brad with his moose and wishes him happy hunting. Brad says, "Yes, indeedy."

The action of the pursuit plot is moving forward with Rex seriously romancing Jan. They smile and hold hands on dates, days and nights, in New York City. Jan is "hitting the moon'' with Brad. We can see girl gets boy and boy gets girl. The characters' display of wealth is in itself not seductive, but part of self-expression even though the language is romanticized and not "natural" like when Rex speaks with a Texas drawl as noted by Cohen (85-87). Thus, Laura Mulvey makes a good point that spectacle (women and objects) is secondary to the action of the plot, which is primary (qtd. in Cohen 79). Moreover, Mark Rubinfeld regards the narrative structure and ideological significance of the romantic comedy plot as depicting how couples are "bound to bond." Specifically, the Hero (Brad as Rex) and the heroine (Jan) are moving forward toward finding the perfect mate. The heroine (Jan) has rejected the prick foil (Jonathan) and is starting to recognize that her hero is Brad. The narrative clearly supports traditional gender roles and a patriarchal ideology when Jan is nearly crushed with the thought of the "pay off" Brad Allen warned her about if she went out with the Texan. However, she is relieved and embarrassed when Rex proves to be different from other men. He did not want sex, which supports the theme of social regeneration through coupling: marriage.

The narrative tropes in Scene Eight are the romantic conversation between Jan and Brad taking separate baths, but appearing to be bathing together; Jan and Alma's

conversation about Brad; Jan and Jonathan's conversation about breaking a date to go out with someone else.

Scene Eight has an interior setting—Jan and Brad's bathrooms, Jan's apartment, and Jonathan's office. Jan is in the bathtub taking a bath when the phone rings. The split screen appears, showing Jan in her bathtub on one half of the screen, and Brad is in his bathtub on the other half of the screen. They are facing each other, making it look like they are sharing one tub. We can see that Brad is seducing Jan with a courteous more passive masculinity. The effect on Brad is that he is changing along with Jan. Jan is falling in love with him and if Brad doesn't want to lose Jan, he will have to give up his playboy life style for marriage. In other words, as noted by Mark Rubinfeld, the hero (Brad) in this pursuit plot is winning the heroine's (Jan's) heart.

Rex calls Jan and tells her that she has done a terrible thing to him, because she made him glad not to be in Texas. He hated New York when he first came, but he doesn't feel that way now. Brad's sweet-talking is making Jan smile and laugh while he is scratching the bathtub wall with his foot to look like he is tickling the bottom of Jan's foot by the way she pulls her foot away. Then she puts her foot back against his, telling Brad she is glad he thinks New York is friendly. As the camera moves from their stretched bodies in the bathtubs to focus on their faces, the audience learns the reason for Rex's call. He wants to see her tonight, but she tells him she already has a date with a client, Jonathan Forbes. When Rex hears Jonathan's name, his eyes widen. Rex as Brad realizes that Jan is the girl Jonathan wants to marry. Suddenly threatened by the thought of losing Jan to Jonathan, Rex tells Jan she ain't the type of girl to break a date. Jan says, "No, I'm not." But she does when Rex tells her he will pick her up at 8:00.

Jan awakes in the morning in a happy mood, telling Alma it's a beautiful day. She realizes Alma was listening to her conversation with Rex because she says he must be something special if she'd break a date for him. She tells Alma that he is special, and when asked Why? Jan says, "He's six-foot-six, handsome, intelligent, owns a mountain." Alma advises her to go get him because six-foot-six-inches of opportunity doesn't come every day. It's like taking a sip of wine to tell if it's a good bottle. Jan tells her this is a good bottle, and Alma says, "Drink up."

Even though Jan and Alma are opposites regarding social class and life experience, Jan has a close relationship with her. Alma seems to serve as a confidant when Jan is expressing her desire for Brad, and Jan listens to her advice, which is to pursue Brad. Alma is like Jan's surrogate mother or best friend, because the film is absent of Jan's mother or a best friend.

Jan is in Jonathan's office. Jonathan sounds upset when he asks Jan why she is evading his questions—Why did she break their date? Did she have another date? You're going out with someone else? When Jan says, yes, Jonathan tells her, "What a cruel thing to say. Who is he?" Jan tells him Rex Stetson. He's visiting from Texas. Jonathan gets Jan to admit she is in love with the Texan, and her admission is a blow to his psyche because he is rejected for a cowboy. He tells her if she marries him she will have to live out there. Then he points out the window to what she will miss—New York! People jostling, shoving, struggling, milling for their lives, and she is part of it. In Texas, he says, "There's nothing but a bunch of prairie dogs and stuff. Even the air is nothing but air. You can feel the air in New York. It has character." The audience can see when Jan kisses Jonathan that she appreciates his concern for her. We also know that Brad does not

know Jan is in love with him. Only Jonathan knows, which means that Jan is rejecting the prick foil (Jonathan) for Brad who is the hero because he has won her heart.

Clearly, the "beauty and goodness" stereotype is evident in this scene, portraying physically attractive individuals in terms of their moral goodness, and romantic activity (Smith, McIntosh, and Bazzini 77), because Brad is transforming by masquerading as Rex and accepting traditional gender roles, a patriarchal ideology and the theme of social regeneration through coupling: heterogeneous marriage, for Jan and Rex do not have sex. Furthermore, the plot is primary and spectacle (women and objects) is secondary, which is Laura Mulvey's interpretation that the romantic comedies serve to showcase the characters (qtd. in Cohen 79).

The dialogue and the material world continue to showcase character in this scene. A display of wealth is part of self-expression (Cohen 85-87) even though the language is romanticized and not "natural" like when Brad says, "Every time I look at you, I say, we got all kinds of natural resources back home, we ain't got nothing like that. . . ."

The narrative tropes in Scene Nine are Brad entering Dr. Maxwell's obstetric office to avoid Jan and Jonathan; Jonathan contacting a detective to find out information about Rex Stetson; Brad delivering three solid gold hit songs to Jonathan's office and finding out the Jan has fallen for him; Brad Allen's negative conversation with Jan about Rex Stetson; Jonathan discovering that his best friend, Brad Allen, is Rex Stetson.

Scene Nine has an interior setting—hallway near Jonathan's office, Dr. Maxwell's waiting room, Jonathan's office, Jan's living room, Brad's bedroom, and Jonathan's office. The elevator door opens and Brad steps out. He smiling as he carries a briefcase and walks toward Jonathan's office, but stops as Jan steps out of Jonathan's

office, with Jonathan in view. The audience knows that Brad does not want his disguise uncovered by Jan or Jonathan, so he instinctively opens the nearest office door and steps inside without knowing what kind of office he is going into. As he closes the door, the audience can see printed on the door, Dr. Maxwell, obstetrician. Three women patients are in the waiting room and a nurse is seated at the reception desk. When Brad sees the nurse, he realizes he is in a doctor's office, but he doesn't know it is an obstetrician. It's comical watching the nurse, the women patients, and the doctor react to Brad, thinking he is having a baby. Brad being in a family way is ironic since he is the ultimate playboy. Perhaps this is a portent that he will give up his bachelorhood for marriage to Jan.

Jonathan takes action against Rex Stetson, thinking he still has a chance with Jan if he can prove that Rex is not the right mate for Jan. He hires Graham, a detective, to get all the information he can on a Rex Stetson from Texas. As Jonathan is putting his coat on, Brad walks through the door with three solid gold hit songs. Jonathan tells him to put them on his desk because he's leaving and mentions to Brad the gal Jan with the party-line nut and how she meets this stupid cowboy from Texas and falls for him. He's going to break them up. Jonathan doesn't know that Brad has been dating Jan, knowing that Jonathan wants to marry Jan. Moreover, Brad now knows Jan is in love with him and not Jonathan. Thus, the hero (Brad) wins the heroine's (Jan's) heart in this pursuit plot. The prick foil (Jonathan) is whipped. Indeed we sense Jonathan's urgency and determination to win Jan's heart from his conversation with Graham and Brad. On the other hand, we know Brad has an advantage over Jonathan when Jonathan tells him Jan is in love with Rex (Brad). This revelation confirms for Brad (Rex) that Jan is passionate about Rex. Clearly, the love story is moving in a linear direction, but we know that Jan hates Brad

and Brad can't keep up the masquerade forever.

Jan is dressed in a luxurious black mink coat and on her way out from her apartment when the phone rings. The split screen shows Brad is in his bedroom and Jan is in her living room. He tells her it's Brad Allen. Jan tells him she is in a hurry, but listens to him telling her that he was right about her Western gentleman turning out to be a prairie wolf when he tried to get her up to his hotel room. But, Jan sets him straight when she admits going to his hotel room, but he showed her Central Park and then they left. Nothing happened. Brad's comeback to "nothing happened" is that Rex may be gay. Jan defends Rex and calls Brad vicious and sick for suggesting this about Rex before she slams down the phone. The audience knows Brad is instigating Jan as a way to move the relationship to intimacy.

Jonathan is in his office with Mr. Graham and sees in a photo that Rex Stetson is his best friend, Brad Allen. He can't believe Brad's taken advantage of him after he asked him what to do about Jan. Jonathan knows that Brad is masquerading as Rex Stetson, but Brad and Jan don't know he knows. Clearly, Jonathan is the romantic rival and Jan will be forced to choose between the two men who are pursuing her in this love story.

The narrative trope in Scene Ten are Jan's worry; Brad's betrayal.

Scene Ten is an interior setting inside the Hidden Door, a little club. It's a close shot of Jan and Rex at the piano bar in a happy mood singing "Roly-Poly" with the pianist. After the song, Rex's conversation with Jan suggests that he is gay when he asks about her job and how it must be exciting working with fabrics and colors, and then wanting the recipe for the tasty bar dip to surprise his mom with when he gets back to Texas. Concerned that Brad Allen was right about Rex, Jan asks him if he finds her

attractive. We know Jan wants more than a friendship with Rex when she tells him he has been a perfect gentleman all the times they have been going out, but it's not flattering. There is a slight smile on his face as he is maneuvering her to prove his manhood. This act engages the sympathies of the audience, which knows homosexuality is not condoned in this time period. And when she asks if their relationship is only a friendship, Rex kisses her, a long and lingering kiss, confirming his manhood and her desire for him as we can see by her dreamy look. She finally found a man who has made her "hit the moon." Now Brad has proof that Jan wants an intimate relationship with him. In fact, Jan is thinking marriage to Rex, which would be most self-fulfilling.

When Jan stands and starts off to fix her lipstick in the powder room, Jonathan and Graham enter the club and spot Brad at the piano bar. Taking charge of the situation, Jonathan takes his lighter and tells Brad, "Need a light, cowboy?" Brad's eyes widen when he realizes Jonathan knows about his masquerade. Without looking at Brad, Jonathan tells him he has two minutes to tell Jan goodbye, put her in a cab, go with him to his apartment and pack for his summer home in Connecticut, the perfect place for writing songs—no phone and twenty miles to the nearest girl. Even though Brad has no choice but to go to Connecticut, we know he will invite Jan, and she does not know about his masquerade. Obviously, the boy wants the girl.

The narrative tropes in Scene Eleven are Rex's lie to Jan; Jan's conversation with Brad Allen; the road trip to Connecticut.

Scene Eleven is an interior and exterior setting—The Hidden Door Club; Jan's apartment; Brad's apartment; the road trip to Connecticut. When Jan returns from the powder room, Rex tells her he has to leave New York that night for Connecticut. We see

Jan's concerned face when she asks for how long. He tells her the weekend because his friend, a business associate, practically forced him to use the house and he couldn't refuse him, especially since he may be buying the place. Clearly, Jan does not want Rex to leave even for the weekend because she found the man who made her "hit the moon." However, her concerned mood changes when calculating Brad asks her to spend the weekend with him in Connecticut. We see that the pianist is aware of Brad's masquerade and appropriately sings "Little White Lies." Accordingly, the mood and tone of the song highlights Brad's mischievous and deceitful behavior toward Jan.

Jan is in her apartment packing for Connecticut when she has the urge to call Brad Allen and tell him that Rex is not gay. The split screen shows that both of them are smiling when Jan tells Brad she was invited to go away with Rex for the weekend. We know Brad is smiling because he is masquerading as Rex and Jan is clueless about his identity. When Brad asks if she will go, Jan tells him he will never know. Jan's confession to Brad about Rex is necessary if Jan's sights are on marriage, which in this time period, as noted by Mark Rubinfeld, is the plot theme of social regeneration through coupling or heterogeneous marriage.

Brad is in his apartment packing for Connecticut and we hear him singing "You are my inspiration, Jan Morrow." It appears his desire for Jan, who naively trusts him, is to have sex without marriage. The male gaze is that it takes time and patience to get sex with a girl like Jan.

The narrative tropes in Scene Twelve are Brad's deceit; Rex's rendezvous with Jan.

Scene Twelve has an exterior and interior setting—the road to Connecticut;

Jonathan's summer house. Rex and Jan are on the road to Connecticut when we hear Jan's internal desires in the lyrics she is singing:

> Hold me tight and kiss me right, I'm yours tonight.
>
> My darling, possess me!
>
> Tenderly, and breathlessly, make love to me.
>
> My darling possess me!
>
> Near to me, when you are near to me, my heart forgets to beat.
>
> Stars that shine, make love divine, so say you're mine.
>
> And my darling possess me! (*Pillow Talk*)

Jan's white "virginal" dress and fur imply innocence, which is humorous in light of her internal monologue, which reveals her hidden, sexual agenda. The female gaze is that she desires sex with Rex. However, this ironic humor creates suspense for the audience, not knowing if she will act on her sexual desires and have sex before marriage.

Jonathan, thinking he has Jan all to himself, has been duped by Brad when he learns from the night manager in Jan's building that she is with Brad at his summer home in Connecticut. Jonathan's brisk exit from Jan's building suggests to the audience that he will take action to win Jan from Brad when she learns that Rex is Brad Allen.

Rex and Jan are embracing on the sofa and drinking champagne in front of a blazing fire in Jonathan's lovely, rustic cottage in the Connecticut woods. Rex is confidant knowing that Jan loves him, so he will get Jan to submit to her sexual desires when he tells her being near her is like a forest fire out of control. The female gaze is that she will not give into her desires since he does not directly tell her he loves her. Showing his manhood by kissing her and making her "hit the moon" will not be enough to tempt

her to have sex without marriage. The male gaze is to achieve seduction with romantic ambience and smooth talk. Clearly, the more romantic Jan and Brad get, the less realistic is the dialogue.

In spite of the champagne and Rex's romantic moves, Jan gracefully moves from Rex's embrace and sits up on the sofa. Rex reacts by telling her the fire is nearly out and he better get some more logs for later, which suggests that Jan's "fire" is out and she is not succumbing to her desires. He is hopeful she will later. On his way out for the firewood he sees a piece of sheet music on the floor, so he hides it in his coat, which is on the chair. Alone in the living room, Jan sees his coat, puts it on, and wraps her arms around it. This action suggests a metaphor. The coat is Rex and figuratively she is inside of him. Therefore, sex by implication is acceptable in this time period, making clear to the audience that she desires sex, but will wait for marriage (Rubinfeld 79).

The narrative tropes in Scene Thirteen are the break-up; the love montage.

Scene Thirteen has an interior and exterior setting—Jonathan's summer house and the road back to New York; the road side diner. Rex comes in with the firewood to Jan playing "Inspiration" on the piano. Her eyes widen into a stare when she realizes that this is the same song Brad Allen sang to his girlfriends, so Rex is masquerading as Brad Allen. When he is holding the firewood and turns to face Jan, he sees her extreme anger as she storms out of the living room to get her suitcases in the bedroom. Brad is weak sounding when he calls her name, realizing he screwed up. It's visible to the audience that he feels remorse when Brad says, "Please." But Jan can't get around his deceit. She throws his coat on top of the firewood and proceeds to leave from the front door when Jonathan charges in calling him a sneaking double-crossing rat. Jan tells Jonathan she

knows Rex is Brad and he is a rat and she wants him (Jonathan) to drive her home. In "classical cinema" the action of the plot rises until it reaches its maximum tension in the climax. It is at the climax, Scene Thirteen, where the protagonist and antagonist clash in order for the confrontation to reach its resolution (Giannetti 232). Jan has the last word with Brad when she brings up her "bedroom problems" and tells him she can solve them in one bedroom but he couldn't solve his in a thousand bedrooms. Jan's break-up with Brad is Jonathan's opportunity to win Jan back.

Jan has been crying uncontrollably in Jonathan's car, so he looks at her sympathetically, and pats her hand understandingly. When the crying and sobbing are getting on his nerves, he stops at a diner thinking coffee will do her some good. Instead, she gets more hysterical, telling Jonathan she feels so ashamed and she thought she was going to get married. Realizing he must do something about Jan's loss of control, Jonathan reaches across the table and slaps her across the face. Two truck drivers at the counter eavesdropping on their conversation think Jonathan is a brute and deserves a lesson. A punch to his jaw lands him unconscious across the seat of the booth. Everything has gone wrong for Jan. She doesn't have the man she loves and the man who loves her has been punished for trying to win her heart.

The narrative tropes in Scene Fourteen are Brad's confession to Jonathan; Jan's rejection of Brad.

Scene Fourteen has an interior setting—Jonathan's office and the office hallway.

Jonathan is using a straw to drink coffee when Brad walks into his office and notices his bruised jaw. Jonathan tells him his jaw and loose teeth belong to him because he was trying to stop Jan from crying when a truck driver slugged him. Brad learns from

Jonathan that he (Brad) made Jan cry and Jonathan never knew a woman her size had so much water in her, and on the advice of his psychiatrist and dentist he is giving Jan up. Finally, Jonathan has reached the resolution that he will never win Jan's heart, but he needed a punch in the face to get a reality check on his love interest. Thus, the heroine (Jan) rejects the romantic foil (Jonathan) because she loves Brad. On the other hand, Brad wants to know if Jonathan has seen Jan and he tells him for the three days he stayed at the house he couldn't write a thing because he felt so guilty. Jonathan tells him if one girl makes him feel guilty, he is in love. Jonathan has been waiting for years for the "mighty tree" (a metaphor for Brad) to topple and he thinks it's wonderful, especially since Jan can't stand him. As Rubinfeld points out, the prick foil (Jonathan) empowers the hero (Brad). Therefore, the prick foil in the prick foil plot is a narrative device that ensures whether the hero wants the heroine (pursuit plot). All the hero has to do is be there (37).

Jan enters Jonathan's office to drop off a painting, not knowing Brad is there. When Jonathan says he believes she is acquainted with Brad Allen, the ex-Rex, Jan quickly hands Jonathan the painting, regards Brad coldly as though he doesn't exist and very businesslike tells Jonathan the end tables will be delivered in the afternoon while she briskly starts for the door. Out in the hallway, Brad follows her to apologize, but Jan doesn't speak to him even though he enters the ladies room behind her, making a quick exit as screaming ladies can be heard in the hallway. Brad looks helpless. The female gaze is that Brad deserves Jan's rejection. The male gaze is that Brad is repentant and he wants to marry Jan. Brad's transformation supports traditional gender roles and the traditional family (Rubinfeld 79).

Back in Jonathan's office Brad poses a question to himself as well as to Jonathan:

How do I get her back? Jonathan is gloating when he tells Brad he doesn't get her back. He just suffers and he (Jonathan) gets to watch. Thinking out loud, Brad tells Jonathan if you want to get on friendly terms with a girl, you're nice to her dog. If there is no dog, you're nice to her mother, but her mother is in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. If worse comes to worse, you work on her maid, but Jonathan says he won't get to first base with Alma. The prick foil (Jonathan) reaffirms the institution of marriage by exposing and then containing the dangers embedded in the eternal triangle, which is two men attracted to one woman and the emotional and sexual tensions that stem from such an attraction. To experience the eternal triangle is to know that romantic love is often problematic (Rubinfeld 37).

The narrative trope in Scene Fifteen is Alma's advice to Brad.

Scene Fifteen has an exterior and interior setting—the front entrance of Jan's apartment building and inside a bar. Brad slips the doorman a tip for pointing to Alma and starts after her. She is waiting at the bus stop when he introduces himself and she tells him she is one of his most devoted listeners. Realizing she knows him from the telephone, he asks her to get a drink somewhere and they go to a bar she recommends. The male gaze is that Alma will be willing to help Brad get Jan to talk with him because she already knows and admires him from eavesdropping on the telephone.

Inside the bar, Alma's one drink to be sociable turns out to be a bottle of scotch and a half bottle of vodka. She can sit upright and maintain her dignity unlike Brad who can't keep up with her drinking. It is comical to watch them, especially Alma who keeps on picking up Brad's head from the table as she offers him advice for his problem, which is that he is in love with Jan. Because he wants to win her back, Alma tells Brad he has to get her to talk with him. Then she tells him to hire her to decorate his apartment, because

two people decorating an apartment is intimate, and she has to talk to him. And once he starts talking, it's only a matter of time. The female gaze is that Alma has a greater inner sense about men and women than Jan or Brad. Moreover, the conventional Hollywood romantic comedy is as much about quashing a woman's (Jan's) resistance as it is about love. Therefore, a diminution of women and the women's movement is evident as well as the ingenious justification, by implication, for the perpetuation of patriarchy in the time period (Rubinfeld 35-36)

The narrative tropes in Scene Sixteen are Brad's hangover; Jan's decision to decorate Brad's apartment; Brad's decision to marry Jan; Jan's revenge; Brad's proof that he loves Jan.

Scene Sixteen has an interior and exterior setting—Brad's apartment, Pierot Interiors, Jonathan's office, different resale shops, and streets in Manhattan. Jonathan is in Brad's apartment. He prepares a cocktail of tomato juice, two raw eggs, olive oil and Worcestershire for Brad's monumental hangover. It's comical to listen to Brad telling Jonathan he stayed with Alma through the scotch but lost her on the vodka. The only thing he remembers is Alma's voice swimming toward him through a sea of scotch, telling him he has an apartment and she decorates apartments. It dawns on Brad that is how he can get to talk with Jan. When Brad finds out from Jonathan that she works at Pierot Interiors, Jonathan reminds Brad that Jan won't talk to him. Brad says Pierot will and has Jonathan dial, asking him not to dial so loud as he holds his head. The male gaze is that Brad can get Jan back if he can get Pierot's sympathy.

Jan is showing Mr. Pierot a sketch that she finished for a client. Pierot notices that she threw out his ideas, but her ideas are better. Then he asks his secretary, Tilda, to call

Brad Allen and tell him it's impossible to decorate Brad's apartment. He is too busy and he will have to find someone else since he can't send Jan because of the way she feels about him (Brad). Jan objects that Pierot is giving up a commission because of her and insists on decorating his apartment much to Pierot's worry that the job may be traumatic. However, Jan tells Pierot that she looks upon him as any other disease. She's had him. She's over him. She is immune to him. Pierot accepts her decision and calls Brad Allen about Jan's decision. The female gaze is that Jan feels she is strong enough to resist Brad Allen, figuratively saying he is like a disease and she is cured. The male gaze is that Brad has Pierot's sympathy, knowing that Brad loves Jan.

Brad acts surprised to see Jan instead of Mr. Pierot. He is polite and friendly, but Jan is extremely impersonal and businesslike, explaining Mr. Pierot couldn't make it, but Brad tells her she will do fine. The audience knows that Mr. Pierot is conspiring with Brad to win Jan back, but Jan doesn't know about their scheme. Jan clearly explains to Brad he is a client and he is paying for her professional services. To pacify Jan, Brad gives her carte blanche to do what she thinks is best, especially when she discovers the light switches dim lights, lock the door, drop a record into play, and automatically open the sofa into a fully made-up bed. Brad tries to tell Jan he is a changed man because he wants to redecorate the place so she'd be comfortable in it, which means getting rid of the bed and anything that is in bad taste. However, Jan is non-committal to what he is implying about decorating the apartment. In fact, she doesn't want contact with him when she tells him he has to move out until she's finished with the job. Not expecting Jan's reaction, Brad says there might be something she'd want to discuss with him. Maintaining her professionalism, Jan tells him he gave her carte blanche unless he

doesn't think she can handle it. Brad agrees to leave the apartment and tells Jan to do the place the way she would like it. The male gaze is to give into the woman you love. The female gaze is to make the man who hurt you suffer. Moreover, the dialogue between Jan and Brad is realistic, and we feel Jan's vengeance and cold treatment of Brad who is remorseful and miserable without Jan.

Back at Pierot's, Jan is seething after her encounter with Brad. She gives Tilda a list of shops to call for purchases, knowing that their stuff is terrible, because she is incensed by Brad's phoniness. She tells Tilda he's like a spider and he expects her to decorate his web. The female gaze is that Brad's approach to winning Jan back is not working. If Jan compares him to a spider, she thinks Brad expects her decorating to attract more flies.

Jan's idea of decorating Brad's apartment is to shop in resale shops where she can find nauseating items. The idea is for women who walk in there to run out screaming. The female gaze is to punish Brad for his phoniness, and pretending to be embarrassed by his functional bachelor pad.

Brad is in Jonathan's office calling his girlfriends about this girl he's met and plans on marrying. As he calls each girl, he crosses her name off the list. The male gaze is that a man serious about marriage must give up being a playboy. The narrative supports a patriarchal ideology while allowing "readings of resistance" in its depictions of a "softer" male (Rubinfeld 79).

Jan calls Brad to tell him his apartment will be ready in the morning. Unbeknown to Brad, his apartment looks like a French bordello, so a calculating playboy does not deceive women. The female gaze is to depict Brad as a wolf.

Jonathan goes with Brad to his apartment. Brad is expecting to see the work of a woman in love. However, Jonathan, who gets the first look, tells Brad he hoped he saved those telephone numbers. When Brad enters, he understands Jan's message. The male gaze is that a man has to be more assertive about his marriage intentions to get the girl he loves. Consequently, Brad kicks Jan's front door, determined to prove his love for Jan. She lets out a scream of surprise when he enters her bedroom and tells her to put her clothes on, because they are going to his apartment. When she tells him she saw it and refuses to go, he drags her from the bed with the blanket wrapped around her and carries her from her apartment to the street. Just like Jan took action against Brad for taking advantage of the party line, Brad is taking action to get the girl he loves.

The narrative tropes in Scene Seventeen are Harry's love interest in Alma; Brad's declaration of love to Jan; Jan's acceptance of Brad's love and marriage proposal. Brad's confrontation with Dr. Maxwell and this nurse in the hall outside Jonathan's office.

Scene Seventeen has an interior and exterior setting. Harry, inspired by Brad's action with Jan, does the same with Alma when he zooms her up in the elevator. As Harry is helping Alma get up from the elevator floor, he tells her she's a nice looking woman and she shouldn't go out drinking every night. If she had a man to take care of, she wouldn't have the time to drink. Harry's comment reflects a patriarchal ideology, for he is suggesting to Alma that he has the power to solve her drinking problem. Obviously, when Alma smiles and tells Harry he is strong, she is letting him know that she is interested in pursuing a relationship with him. The female gaze is that women want a strong, assertive man regardless of social class.

Brad is carrying Jan on the street as he heads for his apartment, getting the

attention of passersby. When they reach the apartment, Jan asks to be put down, but Brad tells her it is customary for the groom to carry the bride across the threshold. Then he dumps her on the bed while he convinces her that he loves her by saying he spent a fortune having the apartment done over, he cut himself off from every girl, and he destroyed himself because he thinks he is getting married. Very angry, he tells Jan she did a great job and can stay here and charge admission. When Brad starts for the door, Jan flicks the light switch that dims the lights, snaps the door shut, and starts the player piano playing "Inspiration." Jan realizes she is the bride, so when Brad can't leave he turns to find her smiling. He smiles. They embrace and kiss, letting the audience know that boy gets girl and girl gets boy. The resolution of this pursuit plot is that the hero overcomes the heroine's resistance and wins her heart.

The narrative trope in Scene Eighteen is Brad's confrontation with Dr. Maxwell and this nurse in the hall outside Jonathan's office.

Scene Eighteen has an interior setting—the hallway outside Jonathan's office.

Three months later, Brad is on his way to Jonathan's office with baby news when Dr. Maxwell and his nurse recognize him as the man who is having a baby. The humor is ironic because Dr. Maxwell thinks Brad is pregnant, which is a reversal of the natural order because women have babies, not men.

As Dr. Maxell and the nurse drag a struggling Brad into the office, two pillows come together. On one pillow is printed "The." On the other pillow is printed "End." Then two more baby pillows appear on top of the two large pillows, one blue and one pink, with the words "Not Quite." Thus, the boy Jan wanted to marry someday, somehow, someway, sometime is Brad Allen. Brad's masquerade and plots are exposed

and Jan is rewarded for her patience by getting Brad legally. Moreover, marriage comes at the end of the film in order to maximize the time resisting marriage because of its fear and suspicion and scheming and plotting to get sex without it.

In 1959 when *Pillow Talk* debuted, this film initiated a series of sex comedies because of its two leading stars, Doris Day and Rock Hudson. This study's intent is to recount from the film's scenes how woman are portrayed in a society that supported traditional gender roles, the traditional family, and a patriarchal ideology where males have power over women. To accomplish this goal, the film was analyzed for its visual characteristics, narrative patterns, plots, themes, mood, and tone using primarily two film scholars, Tamar Jeffers McDonald and Mark Rubinfeld. Other film scholars provided additional insight to this study. For example, Louis Giannetti offers eight characteristics to consider about the set, and ten characteristics to consider about the costume, which are the visual characteristics important to the portrayal of women. Specifically the women characters are Caucasian, but some are from different social classes. Jan (Doris Day) and Brad's (Rock Hudson's) girlfriends are twenty-something, attractive, educated, and moneyed to be able to afford their upscale apartments with doormen and have the means to be fashionable and glamorous. Alma, Jan's housekeeper, and Miss Dickinson, the telephone company inspector do not dress as fashionably as Jan because of their jobs, and they do not have professional careers, for interior decorators were considered professionals. Mr. Pierot, Jan's boss, treats Jan as an equal professional, because he acknowledges and respects her talent, sophistication, education, fashion sense, and confidence with him and clients. Moreover, the "beauty and goodness" stereotype put forth by social psychologists Stephen Smith, William McIntosh and Doris Bazzini does

not apply to all physically attractive individuals in terms of their moral goodness and romantic activity such as Brad's girlfriends and Brad before Jan transforms him to give up his playboy lifestyle for marriage.

Even though all the women in the film were working-women, there is a distinction between the twenty-something women and the older women, Alma and Mrs. Walters. Besides being Jan's maid, Alma is Jan's confidant and advisor, clearly indicative that she had more experience with men than Jan. In fact, the film implies that Alma is sexually experienced. Mrs. Walters, Jan's wealthy client, is depicted as self-centered, and comically stupid. On the other hand, Brad's twenty-something moneyed girlfriends are willing to have sex before marriage, thinking Brad will give up his bachelorhood for matrimony. Unlike Brad's girlfriends, Jan wants to get married on her terms as the audience knows from the opening scene when she sings "Pillow Talk" about the boy she will marry someday, somehow, someway, sometime. But her career takes precedence over romance even though she dated a lot of nice men like Jonathan Forbes (Tony Randall), because Jan believes love is a precursor to marriage, which she feels will happen when she is kissed by a man who makes her "hit the moon." Moreover, her apartment décor and white attire in several scenes seem to be a metaphor for her virginity or sexual innocence.

Jan's assertiveness is attractive to the female audience because we can see that she stands up to Brad, the calculating, wolfish playboy. She takes action against Brad's abuse of the party line they share by going to the telephone company and expecting a private party line. In spite of her assertiveness, articulation, and professional appearance, the phone company only agrees to send out an inspector. The fact that the inspector is a

woman is intended humor as viewers watch Brad use his charisma and smooth talk to get the complaint nullified. Obviously, Jan is incensed by the outcome, which increases her hatred for Brad, whom she deems is an impudent jerk and a sex maniac. Even when Brad calls Jan and tries to make amends for his behavior by asking her to get some coffee with him because he thinks they have a lot in common, Jan strikes back, telling him they have nothing in common and slams the phone down.

Also, the women characters are contrasted with opposite personas. Jan is an opposite of Alma because she is functional and Alma is alcoholically dysfunctional and comedy is made out of Alma's misery. Jan's ethical standards are in opposition to Alma's, who eavesdrops on Brad's conversations with girlfriends and Jan. Brad's girlfriends are for premarital sex and Jan is not. Miss Dickinson is weak by succumbing to Brad's charisma, making her vulnerable and naïve about the ways of men, and Jan is assertive and abhorrent of Brad's exploitation of women and his impudent behavior toward her. Jan does not want to be pursued by Jonathan, but Brad's girlfriends want to be pursued by Brad. With the exception of Jan, the younger women let their emotions interfere with their sense of morality, for it takes a clever, righteous, and confident woman to uncover the ulterior motive of men who use women for their personal gain. For example, Jan shows moral rectitude with Rex after she falls in love with him, but Brad's girlfriends do not.

In a patriarchal society, women recognize that what matters most are men, marriage, and motherhood. When Jan and Rex (Brad) are having a conversation about their families, Jan says she believes in large families and Rex agrees. However, the irony here is that Brad is still the playboy and anti-marriage when the audience hears his

thoughts, “Five or six dates ought to do it.” However, if he believes in large families, it is achieved after marriage in this time period. Moreover, after Jan falls in love with Rex and wants sex, she does not succumb to her desires. Her patience is rewarded with marriage before sex and motherhood.

The spectacle or the visual characteristics presented by the setting and costumes, is secondary to the plot, which is primary (Mulvey qtd. in Cohen 79), because it reveals the film’s themes, which are masquerade, a hierarchy of knowledge, and the reversions, inversions of the “natural order” (McDonald 45).

The hierarchy of knowledge means *he* knows more than *she* and we know more than either. Instances of women knowing more than men are the following: Jan knows Mr. Pierot has to keep his disdain for Mrs. Walters to himself; Jan knows that Brad’s girlfriends are having sex with him; Jan knows that Brad is masquerading as Rex when she plays “Inspiration” on the piano in Jonathan’s Connecticut summer house.

A reversal of the “natural order” is apparent when the women speak in a romanticized, unrealistic way, and they represent untraditional gender roles in a patriarchal society. Examples are these: Jan is assertive with playboy, Brad; Jan takes action against Brad’s abuse of the party line; Jan is assertive about Brad’s insolent and disrespectful behavior when he tells her she doesn’t like living alone and she is taking her “bedroom problems” out on him; Eileen’s conversation with Brad is romanticized; it is unrealistic for Jan to think love comes when a man’s kiss makes her “hit the moon”; Jan is not passive toward Brad, making clear to him that she has no interest in reconciliation after he tries to apologize for his rudeness and abuse of the party line; Marie’s conversation with Brad is romanticized; Jan’s assertive with twenty-one-year-old Tony

Walters at the Copa and she seems to be thinking this young man is primitive and a sharp contrast to the nice men she dates.

The masquerade is Brad pretending to be Rex, the Texan, because he knows Jan Morrow, with whom he shares the party line, despises him; therefore, he has to lie to romance her. At first his intentions are to have sex with her even though she is a challenge. As he spends time romancing her days and nights in New York City, he realizes that she is special and his best friend, Jonathan, is right that marriage can be wonderful. In other words, Brad is transforming by masquerading as Rex and accepting traditional gender roles, a patriarchal ideology and marriage. However, when Brad's masquerade is discovered by Jan, who is in love with Rex, she can't get around Brad's deceit. This is the climactic scene because the protagonist (Brad) and the antagonist (Jonathan) clash in order for the confrontation to reach its resolution. Thus, Jan's break-up with Brad (Rex) is Jonathan's opportunity to win Jan back. But Jonathan does not win Jan back. His reality check is the truck driver punching his face at the diner. Punished for trying to win Jan's heart, Jonathan gives up his love interest. Thus, the prick foil empowers the hero, Brad, as a way to ensure whether the hero wants the heroine. All Brad has to do is be there (Rubinfeld 37). And Brad wants Jan because he is miserable without her. Because he is remorseful, he is in love and he needs Alma's help to get Jan back. Alma helps Brad squash Jan's resistance when she advises him to hire her to decorate his apartment. When Jan accepts the project, she tells Brad he is a client paying for her professional service, but her intent is vengeance. Transforming his apartment into a French Bordello is a message Brad gets. Just like Jan taking action against Brad for taking advantage of the party line, Brad takes action to get the girl he loves. He declares

his love; Jan accepts his love and marriage proposal. The boy gets girl and the girl get boy and the resolution of this pursuit plot is that the hero overcomes the heroine's resistance and wins her heart.

The narrative structure as noted by film scholar Mark Rubinfeld, is a pursuit plot from a male point of view consisting of a quest, obstacle, and resolution of the love story. The quest is for the hero (Brad) to win the heroine's (Jan's) heart. The obstacle is the heroine (Jan) resisting the hero's (Brad's) love. The resolution is the hero (Brad) overcomes the heroine's (Jan's) resistance and wins her heart. However, for the pursuit plot to work, there must be a prick foil or a romantic rival. Jonathan (Tony Randall) is the prick foil and his ideological function is to help out the hero (Brad) by ensuring the success of the pursuit plot. In fact, Jan's resistance to Jonathan is not only a portent that Brad will be the hero, but she and the hero must reject the romantic prick (obstacle) and recognize that they are meant for each other, perfect mates (resolution).

In the beginning and end of the film, the sequence of events proceed in a linear storytelling manner much like the male sex act in its insistent forward motion, as noted by film theorist Laura Mulvey (qtd. in Cohen 79), while presenting female and male gazes. When the goal is reached, boy gets girl and girl get boy, the couple gets married before sex, which supports traditional gender roles, family and a patriarchal ideology.

The female gazes or points of view come along with the action of the plot. Examples are the following: Jan will not tolerate Brad's impudent behavior, because her desire to make a work-related call takes precedence over romance when sharing a party line; Jan resists Jonathan because she chooses work over romance and does not want to be pursued, so he is set up as the prick foil; Miss Dickinson symbolizes women who are

vulnerable to calculating playboys, so boy get girl, not girl gets boy; perhaps Alma drinks and eavesdrops on conversations because being a domestic is boring, repetitive work; sending a women telephone inspector to a calculating playboys apartment shows how some women let their emotions interfere with their sense of morality; Jan has the right to tell Brad he is not sticking to the phone schedule; Brad and Jonathan have opposite mindsets regarding commitments; women in this time period agree with Jonathan on the virtues of marriage; a wolfish man does not get an extra special girl like Jan—sweet, talented, and lovely; Jan's eye contact with Rex at the Copa when he is assisting her with Tony, shows she is instantly attracted to Rex because he is smiling and a gentleman; Jan gets Rex (girl gets boy) when he calls her for a dinner date the day after he helps her with Tony and tells her she is "like a pot-bellied stove on a frosty morning"; Jan thinks Rex is just like all the other men who want sex without marriage when he takes her to his hotel room to get his coat; Jan learns that some men are morally good like Rex when he doesn't want the "pay off" in the hotel room; Jan liked being romantically surprised when the drive after dinner was in a horse and buggy. The unexpected is sexually appealing to women; Jan will not give into her desire to have sex with Rex since he does not directly tell her he loves her. Showing his manhood by kissing her and making her "hit the moon" is not enough temptation for Jan to have sex without marriage; Brad deserves Jan's rejection for being deceitful; squashing a woman's (Jan's) resistance is a diminution of a woman and by implication evidence of patriarchy in this time period; Jan's revenge is strong enough to resist Brad, especially when she says he is like a disease and she is cured; Jan makes Brad suffer for him hurting her by decorating his apartment like a French bordello. She wants to punish him for his phoniness, and pretending to be

embarrassed by his functional bachelor pad; women want strong, assertive men regardless of social class.

The effect of the pursuit plot with a male point of view on the portrayal of women is that the woman's gaze, even if assertive toward the domineering male, is suppressed when the hero overcomes the heroine's resistance and wins her heart. The conventional Hollywood romantic comedy quashes a woman's resistance while telling a love story that perpetuates a patriarchal ideology. Moreover, the hierarchy of knowledge is greater for the male and the audience than it is for the female, who does not know about the males' manipulation and thoughts. Additionally, women as spectacle are attractive rewards for the males' efforts at seduction, so women can't move the plot forward, only men can. Thus, the attitude of males toward women in the 1959 culture is presented by the direction of Michael Gordon, who romanticizes females and exploits them for the males' benefit.

Finally, the portrayal of women in *Pillow Talk* expresses the overriding theme that females seek self-fulfillment through marriage. The character's dialogue and plot are balanced and their speech moves the plot to reach the resolution with the narrative elements of setting, themes, tone, mood, and point of view while reflecting the social structure of the period.

The study of this quintessential romantic comedy is critical to understanding how women are portrayed in other Day romantic comedies such as *Lover Come Back* (1961), *That Touch of Mink* (1962)*, Move, Over, Darling* (1963), and *Send Me No Flowers* (1964). Film scholars Tamar Jeffers McDonald, Mark Rubinfeld, and Louis Giannetti provide the direction for this study. Masquerade is the main plot mechanism. In *Move,*

Over, Darling, Ellen (Doris Day) pretends to her ex-husband's new wife Bianca (Polly Bergen) that she is a Swedish masseuse. Besides the masquerade theme so fundamental to the sex comedy, the other themes are hierarchy of knowledge and reversals of the usual order of things. The audience is usually at the top of the hierarchy when they know the man or the woman is assuming a different persona as a scam, and knows more than the man or woman who is the object of the plotting. Because the viewer knows more than either character, the effect is suspense and humor (McDonald 45; 47-48). In fact, film scholar, Celestino Deleyto contends that "romantic comedy involves three key constituents: a narrative about love, gender, and sexual relationships; a space of magical transformation that frees the characters from inhibitions so they can explore their desire; and humor which establishes a benevolent perspective" (Grindon Web). Moreover, the reversal of the usual order of things is for comic effect. In Day's *Lover Come Back* (1961), the reversal is through the manipulations of playboy Jerry Webster (Rock Hudson) who decides to punish his advertising agency rival, Carol Templeton (Doris Day), by making her fall in love with him and tricking her into giving him her virginity. To do this he invents Linus Tyler, a Nobel Prize scientist, who is hopeless with women. Carol has never met Jerry so she doesn't know that Jerry is pretending to be Tyler. The reversal creates the man's (Jerry's) passivity and the woman's (Carol's) actions because it is assumed that men are not passive and women are not in charge. The actions are funny because it is the woman and not the man teaching the man to dance and swim, taking the man out to dinner, buying the man clothes, getting the man a haircut, and trying to seduce the man in her apartment. Clearly, this film supports conservative and traditional values. That is, social regeneration through coupling: marriage, and a

patriarchal ideology (Rubinfeld 78). Carol's one night stand complete with a marriage license with Jerry as Tyler because of an intoxicating candy results in Carol getting the marriage annulled. However, the film ends with Jerry remarrying Carol in a hospital maternity ward, just before she gives birth to their child.

Other considerations for this study are the significance of setting, costume, and make-up. Film scholar Louis Giannetti provides eight characteristics for setting and ten characteristics for costume, which he believes can reveal the theme and characterization (252-253; 256). In *Lover Come Back* (1961) the fantasy setting of the bachelor's apartment is equipped with seduction: music swells, lights dim, doors lock and the couch coverts to a double bed with the flick of a switch. The female's apartment by contrast is attractive and spacious, but not a lair of seduction. Thus, each of Day's romantic comedies will portray women somewhat the same but differently when analyzing each film's narrative elements of character, setting, plot, themes, tone, mood, point of view which reflect the ideology of the time period. Like *Pillow Talk*, the overriding theme is that females seek self-fulfillment through marriage.

CHAPTER 4

HOW WOMEN ARE PORTRAYED IN THE MEG RYAN ROMANTIC COMEDY *WHEN HARRY MET SALLY* (1989)

Thirty years after *Pillow Talk,* a sex comedy, Nora Ephron wrote *When Harry Met Sally*. According to film scholar Tamar Jeffers McDonald's historical perspective, Ephron's film is an example of a neo-traditional romantic comedy, which lasted twenty years and ten years longer than McDonald's other romantic comedy subgenres in her historical perspective. In this time period, audiences once again were interested in a narrative structure where boy meets, loses, regains girl, and the emphasis on the heterosexual couple by the end of their story forming a lasting relationship. In other words, viewers wanted a return to older conventions. The AIDS crisis, the rise of the religious right and its emphasis on sexual caution, monogamy, and abstinence effected the reassertion of family values (85-86; 88). Moreover, the neo-traditional subgenre avoided being dated by references to popular culture and consumer products rather than political and historical events such as the Black Panther movement, the Vietnam War, and the assassinations of the 1960s, which date films.

There are several traits common to the neo-traditional subgenre. One trait is nostalgia for earlier movies; therefore, audiences were expected to get the references to older movies and realize the female protagonist seeks old-fashioned but not impossible romantic love. For example, in *Kat*e *and Leopold* (Meg Ryan and Hugh Jackman) (2001), the film references *The Goodbye Girl* (Richard Dreyfuss and Marsha Mason) (1977). However, McDonald points out that neo-traditional romantic comedy borrowings are difficult to discern (87). Another trait of the neo-traditional subgenre is the setting, New

York City, which can be recognized by landmarks, buildings, bridges, and shops frequented by tourists. The cinematic portrayal of the city is where romantic love happens, making the city a guarantee for a successful love story (Jerymn 10). By referencing the city using visual elements, filmmakers as noted by McDonald create a romantic mood. Real details of everyday life are used to stage the action and the way it is photographed rather than as aspects which inform the narrative (McDonald 89-90). In fact, McDonald is suggesting that the real details of everyday life in New York City is part of the spectacle, which Paula Marantz Cohen, literary critic, academic nonfiction writer and humanities professor at Drexel University, contends is central in romantic comedies (81-83).

Besides referencing nostalgic films and the New York City setting, other traits common to the neo-traditional romantic comedy are self-reflexivity, a de-emphasizing of sex, and recurring themes, visuals, music, and film titles that signify their romantic comedy status (McDonald 91). Nora Ephron's 1989 film, *When Harry Met Sally,* is a useful example of a neo-traditional film demonstrating the characteristics common to this romantic comedy, and also confirming the effectiveness of these characteristics in evoking audience emotions.

In addition to Tamar Jeffers McDonald's neo-traditional subgenre of the romantic comedy, this study of how women are portrayed in romantic comedies will consider the perspective of film scholar, Hilary Radner, who dubbed the term "neo-feminism," noting while it has influenced the "post-feminist" culture, it has little to do with feminism. In fact, she says it "only very tangentially is a consequence of feminism; while it incorporates catch phrases such as 'empowerment' and 'self-fulfillment'" (2). Moreover,

Radner contends that the cinema is ideal for analyzing trends in popular thought. Specifically, in the 1980s, the representation of women onscreen reflected a neo-feminist perspective on women's sexuality. Therefore, this study will examine *When Harry Met Sally* (1989) for significant traits that unite neo-feminist films: a charismatic female star embodying a character at the center of her universe who is a "working woman"; an emphasis on fashion and consumer culture; the disappearance of chastity as a "feminine virtue"; romance as a significant theme (If not always the primary plot); the privileging of the "do-over" as the resolution to seemingly insurmountable problems (3). In other words, "neo-feminism seeks to provide a means of survival and success for women without family or other sources of material support, counts her own body and the work that it performs as her principal source" (Radner 11). Consequently, neo-feminism challenges a patriarchal ideology as Helen Gurley Brown asserts when she says, "The single girl achieves her identity outside marriage and, significantly, does not define herself in terms of maternity" (qtd. in Radner 11). However, Radner points out that neo-feminism does not discourage maternity; it only displaces the centrality it held in the early twentieth-century and nineteenth-century accounts of feminine self-fulfillment (11).

Hollywood exploited the neo-feminism paradigm of feminine identity because it encourages and reinforces consumer culture practices (Radner 8). Concerned with production numbers in the1980s, women became the target of a new genre, the female friendship films, and the return of the romantic comedy, which incorporated elements of the female friendship film. The success of *When Harry Met Sally* led to the rise of other neo-traditional films, with the heroine, Sally (Meg Ryan), representing a new version of the "Cosmo Girl," who differed from Helen Gurley Brown, the editor-in-chief of

Cosmopolitan for thirty-two years whose life and writings exemplify the neo-feminist paradigm, by putting the affairs of the heart before fiscal responsibility, while being a working girl (Radner 28). In fact, Nora Ephron, journalist, novelist, screenwriter, producer, director, blogger and writer of *When Harry Met Sally*, said Helen Gurly Brown advocated "that the Single Girl with no other man in her life must somehow make the men that are there serve a purpose" (qtd. in *Neo-Feminist Cinema* 16). However, Brown was married by the time she was the guiding light for single women. As the wife of a famous film producer, David Brown, she continued to work and present herself as a glamorous and desirable woman or the "yummy mummy" representing the neo-feminist ideal, acting and looking like a "single girl" who must work for her living while parading in a media-oriented environment (Radner 17-18). And Brown believes "women, married or single, are better off working at least some of the time for self-realization, and to retain their mobility as part of a paid labor force; to be in the position to spend money on dieting, exercise, fashion and grooming, and in so doing remain attractive to men" (Radner 20). Yet, Brown is not anti-marriage, for it is the ideal position for a woman, so she is almost never critical of men. Instead, she says men are a series of opportunities and obstacles that a woman encounters to achieve economic stability. The unmarried woman can lead a fulfilling life if she is careful with money. That is, thrift and self-restraint are linked to economic and emotional fulfillment. With this being said, the importance of *When Harry Met Sally* to this study is to show how analyzing its visual characteristics, narrative patterns, plots, themes, tone, mood, point of view, and ideology portrays women.

When Harry Met Sally has endured as a popular film because this romantic

comedy seems to entice viewers with its modern attitude to long-term relationships. The couple does not simply fall in love and live happily ever after. They have a real understanding of what they're letting themselves in for, so it's easy for viewers to sympathize with them. Moreover, the witty dialogue, and the memorable one-liners and quotes make this film worthy of multiple viewings.

The title *When Harry Met Sally* tells the audience that the film revolves around two characters: Harry Burns (Billy Crystal) and Sally Albright (Meg Ryan). It's the spring of 1977 when Harry meets Sally at the University of Chicago. Even though they don't know each other, Sally asks Harry to share the driving to New York where they plan to start their careers as a journalist and a political consultant, respectively. On the long trek to New York, they learn they have nothing in common and couldn't possibly be friends, especially when Harry opines that a man and woman can never be friends because the man will always want sex with the woman. However, their relationship doesn't end after the road trip to New York. The audience journeys with Sally and Harry as they mature over ten years. Initially their relationship is hostile, but as they meet coincidently and occasionally, they become intimate friends, sharing their hopes, dreams, failures, and successes before they fall in love.

The narrative structure is the pursuit plot from the male's point of view. It is a story about a man who does not use force to control and/or possess a woman. Instead, he uses subtle manipulation along with pity and guilt (Rubinfeld 31). However, the pursuit plot is combined with the coldhearted redemption plot and it is delivered from a male point of view while emphasizing female emotions. Moreover, the hero (Harry) of the coldhearted redemption plot is bitter and incapable of love. He is scared of commitment

and struggles to say, “I love you.” What he needs is a redemptive heroine (Sally) or “good deferrer.” She is like a “good wife,” respectful and obedient and the hero’s lifeline (Rubinfeld 14; 23; 27).

In the coldhearted redemption plot, the quest is for the hero to seek salvation from a bitter life; the obstacle is that the hero is afraid to love and/or be loved; the resolution is achieved when the heroine’s love changes the hero into a loving mate. In between the beginning and end of the film, the sequence of events represent a process that reaches the goal, which is the theme of social regeneration through coupling or marriage. Moreover, the coldhearted redemption plot supports the traditional gender role of the respectful female while downplaying and occasionally challenging the traditional gender role of the dominant male. Furthermore, the narrative supports the traditional family, yet requiring the husband to be more responsible for the family’s emotional welfare, and it supports a patriarchal ideology while allowing for a “softer male” (Rubinfeld 79; 157).

The narrative trope in Scene One is an elderly man reminiscing about his fifty-year-long marriage.

Scene One is an interior setting. In documentary fashion, an older Caucasian couple sits together on a loveseat looking straight at the camera, while the husband recounts how he met his wife of fifty years. They are real people, not actors, who are happily married. It appears that the elderly couple is a metaphor for an old-fashioned love story the audience is about to see. However, the audience’s expectation of the love story’s development is not predictable. Will the courtship be a short two weeks like this couple, or dragged out over time? Moreover, the fact that the couple was married in 1939 and stayed married for fifty years is indicative of a society that supported traditional gender

roles, the traditional family, and a patriarchal ideology (Rubinfeld 79). Perhaps this is a portent that Harry and Sally, like this elderly couple, espouse the same societal conventions.

The narrative tropes in Scene Two are conversations between Harry and Sally in the car and the diner.

Scene Two has an interior and exterior setting—The University of Chicago campus, where the road trip to New York begins, and inside a 1950s diner. The University of Chicago campus in 1977, ten years ago, lets the audience know the scene is a flashback in time so that the love story we are about to see appears to develop over time. Thus, Scene Two serves as the exposition section of the narrative arc. The director, Rob Reiner, introduces the time, 1977, the places, Chicago and New York City, the cultural context, which depicts women as equal to men in pursuing advanced education in prestigious institutions. And because the Production Code no longer existed in this time period, movies were rated. The R rating this movie received depicts independent educated women who are open about sex. For example, there are many kissing scenes, sex-related dialogue, Sally's fake orgasm in front of everyone in a restaurant, and Harry and Sally's nudity from the shoulders up in bed, implying they are having sex. The moral climate did not chastise "nice" girls who did not insist on marriage before sex. The stock characters are Caucasian, twenty-something, educated, and moneyed.

When Scene Two begins, the audience hears Louis Armstrong singing the first stanza of "Love is Here to Stay." On the University of Chicago campus, Harry (Billy Crystal) is passionately kissing his girlfriend Amanda (Michelle Nicastro) when Sally Albright (Meg Ryan), Amanda's friend, pulls up in yellow Volvo station wagon. She

waits for the kiss to end, but when it doesn't, she clears her throat to get their attention. It takes hitting the horn to break Harry and Amanda's embrace. At this point, Amanda introduces Harry to Sally, who will be driving with Sally to New York to start new lives. As noted by film scholar, Tamar Jeffers McDonald, the neo-traditional subgenre of romantic comedy begins with Harry and Sally heading to New York, the setting where romantic love happens. This part of Scene Two also shows sexual intimacy with explicit kissing between Harry and Amanda and their exchange of "I love you's, I'll call you's and goodbyes." Clearly, Harry and Amanda's sexual relationship is telling of relationships between men and women in 1989. Since the advent of the birth control pill in 1960, women did not fear pregnancy and engaged in premarital sex. Moreover, Sally and Amanda are college-educated women in a prestigious school, preparing to be working girls. Furthermore, Louis Armstrong is an icon from the past, which supports the nostalgia neo-traditional trait put forth by McDonald. Moreover, the lyrics to "Love is Here to Stay" is related to the film's title, and Harry and Sally will fall in love and marry.

Since Harry and Sally do not know each other and the drive to New York is eighteen hours long, Sally takes the initiative to set up a shared driving schedule, and Harry takes the initiative to pass the time constructively with conversation. As the scene evolves, we learn that Harry and Sally are complete opposites. Sally does not eat between meals, and Harry does. At age twenty-one, Sally tells Harry nothing has happened in her life, which is why she is going to journalism school in New York to become a reporter. Harry, age twenty-six, tells Sally he just graduated from law school, but sees law as a jumping off point. He is a pessimist and she is an optimist. For example, he has a dark side, explaining to Sally that he always reads the last page of a new book just in case he

dies before he finishes the book. He also spends hours and days thinking about death. On the other hand, Sally tells Harry she is basically a happy person. Moreover, the shared driving is gender opposites. Perhaps this scene is implying that opposites attract since this is a love story about the title "*When Harry Met Sally*." And as McDonald points out, self-reflexivity (a heightened consciousness of self) by Harry and Sally is another trait common to the neo-traditional romantic comedy (67).

It's nightfall when Harry and Sally are heading toward a hotel/diner. Sally is the passenger and they are discussing *Casablanca* from opposite perspectives. Harry says Rick (Humphrey Bogart) wants his old flame, IIsa Lund (Ingrid Bergman), whom he still loves, to stay even though he puts her on the plane. Sally says IIsa doesn't want to stay in Casablanca for the rest of her life married to a man (Rick) who runs a bar, because she is very practical. Sally's point is that great sex isn't enough to stay with Rick. Harry's point is that great sex is the reason to stay. To drive his point home to Sally, he tells her as they enter the diner that she has never had great sex. Of course, Sally is assertive on this issue and tells Harry and the entire diner that she has had plenty of good sex. Clearly, Sally is challenging patriarchal ideology as she represents the neo-feminist perspective on women's sexuality, which is the disappearance of chastity as a "feminine virtue" put forth by film scholar, Hillary Radner. Obviously, Sally, who is younger than Harry, appears to have a more mature grasp on male and female love relationships. The female gaze is that intimacy between a man and women requires more than great sex. The male gaze is that great sex is all a woman needs for a long lasting relationship, which is supported by a patriarchal ideology—men have power over women by providing great sex. Furthermore, the neo-traditional trait, nostalgia, is depicted with the 1941 movie *Casablanca* and the

1950 style diner. As noted by film scholar, McDonald, nostalgic references imply that the female protagonist seeks old-fashioned romantic love. And the film title *Casablanca* signifies a romantic love story.

"Ramblin' Man" (1969) is playing in the diner while Harry and Sally continue the conversation about great sex. It's comical to listen to Harry react to Sally having great sex with Shel Gordon when he says, "Sheldon can do your taxes. If you need a root canal, he's your man, but between the sheets is not Sheldon's strong suit. . . . I love you, Sheldon. Do it to me, Sheldon. I can't get enough of you, Sheldon. It doesn't work." Besides disagreeing with Sally about having great sex with Sheldon, another opposite characteristic of both is illustrated when they order food. Harry tells the waitress he will have a Number Three. However, Sally likes to be in control of situations like the way she is very specific about what she orders—"a chef salad, oil and vinegar on the side, and apple pie a la mode. I'd like the pie heated and I don't want the ice cream on top, but on the side, and I'd like strawberry not vanilla, if you have it, if not, whip cream, but only if it is real, not out of the can, if not nothing, just the pie, not heated." With the order placed, Harry asks Sally why she broke up with Sheldon, assuming if she didn't, she would not be here. Just as straightforward as Harry, Sally tells him she is not with him, and it is none of his business. Then she decides to tell Harry they broke up because Shel was jealous and it had to do with her days of the week underpants, explaining that she never wore Sunday and he didn't believe that Sunday was not made because of God. He wanted to know where she left Sunday. The female gaze is that men are insecure if they don't trust their sexual partner, thinking she found better sex with someone else. The male gaze is that a man's sexual prowess supports a patriarchal ideology. Moreover,

common to neo-traditional romantic comedy are recurring oldies music ("Ramblin' Man") and the nostalgic trait depicted by Sally's ex-boyfriend, Sheldon Gordon. Furthermore, Harry is a "rambling man" since he is promiscuous.

The narrative tropes in Scene Three are Harry and Sally's conversations in the diner and car and their departure in New York.

Scene Three has an interior and exterior setting—inside the diner and the car ride to New York. The check arrives, and we hear Jennifer Warnes singing "Right Time of the Night" while Sally is figuring her portion of the bill. She notices Harry staring at her. Thinking she has food on her face, she nervously wipes and asks, "What do I have?" However, Harry's stare is his inner thoughts about Sally's attractiveness. When he verbalizes her attractiveness, Sally interprets the comment as a come-on to her and is appalled, because he is going with Amanda, her friend. Harry won't admit to coming on to Sally, because he feels it is not coming on to a woman if he tells her she is attractive. Here Harry and Sally have different opinions about what constitutes coming on to a woman, and Sally's point of view on the matter represents the neo-feminist perspective, which challenges a patriarchal ideology in which men have power over women if they can manipulate them with sexually appealing words such as "attractive." The female gaze is that a man in a relationship with a woman (Harry and Amanda) should not be unfaithful verbally or otherwise with another woman. The male gaze is that a man in a relationship should not be chastised if he compliments a woman. He is not going to bed with her. Moreover, "The Right Time Of The Night" by Jennifer Warnes represents recurring music from the past, a nostalgic neo-traditional trait. And for Sally it is not "the right time of the night" to make love.

After Harry and Sally exit the diner, they sit in the car continuing their diner conversation. Harry for the sake of argument agrees with Sally it was a come-on, and asks her, "What do you want me to do? I take it back." But Sally tells him he can't take it back, because it is already out there. Harry's comeback is comical when he says, "Oh jeez. What are we supposed to do now? Call the cops? It's already out there." Sally depicts the neo-traditional trait of de-emphasizing sex when she tells Harry, "Just let it lie, okay? . . . And we are just going to be friends, okay?"

As the car starts up, and pulls out, a long silence is broken when Harry tells Sally that they can never be friends, because the sex thing will doom the friendship. Sally does not agree, saying that she has male friends where sex is not an issue. However, Harry tells Sally that her male friends want to have sex with her. Clearly, Harry and Sally's argument reveals that Harry believes women, attractive or unattractive, are the sexual objects of men's desires. In other words, Harry thinks all men are like him for wanting to lay a woman. Sally cannot accept Harry's theory about male-female relationships, which challenges a patriarchal ideology put forth by neo-feminism (Radner 11), and perpetuates the gendered sexual order as noted by Rubinfeld (79). Moreover, the neo-traditional self-reflexivity trait is evident because Sally is assertive, by her taking a stand on friendship between males and females. Obviously, Sally does not support traditional gender roles pointed out by Rubinfeld (79).

As the car comes over the George Washington Bridge, on a gorgeous day, Louis Armstrong is singing, "Let's Call the Whole Thing Off." Downtown near Washington Square, the car pulls up and Harry hops out, grabbing his stuff. The song is significant because Harry doesn't want a friendship with Sally. When Harry walks off and Sally

drives off, the road trip to New York is part of their past, just like the song evokes nostalgia, a neo-traditional trait (McDonald 87). And the setting, New York, is another neo-traditional trait (McDonald 89), where romantic love happens, making the city a guarantee for a successful love story (Jerymn 10). Since recurring themes is a characteristic of neo-traditional romantic comedies, it is likely that we will see Harry and Sally meeting again.

The narrative tropes in Scene Four are an elderly couple reminiscing about their courtship and marriage, and Harry and Sally's encounter at La Guardia Airport.

Scene Four has an interior setting—La Guardia airport. In documentary fashion, an older Caucasian couple sits together on a loveseat looking straight at the camera, while the husband and wife take turns recounting their courtship and marriage:

> We fell in love in high school (wife speaking). We were high school sweethearts (husband). But then after junior year, his parents moved away (wife). But I never forgot her (husband). He never forgot me (wife). Her face was burned on my brain, and it was thirty-four years later when I was walking on Broadway that I saw her (husband).

They are real people, not actors, who are happily married. It appears that the elderly couple represents different ways a couple meets, which is significant to the next scene when Harry and Sally meet for the second time at La Guardia airport.

It's five years later, 1982, at La Guardia Airport. Sally, twenty-six, is kissing an attractive man named Joe. Both are dressed in expensive-looking suits. Finally, Sally and Joe become aware that someone is standing nearby and it's Harry who recognizes Joe, but doesn't seem to remember Sally, so the two men talk about their jobs—Joe is no

longer in the D.A's office, switching to the other side. Harry is working for a small company as a political consultant. When Joe introduces Sally Albright to Harry Burns, he tells Sally they lived in the same building. The eye contact between Sally and Harry reveals that Harry has seen Sally someplace, but he can't remember where. And Sally is relieved that he couldn't place her as she tells Joe about the longest drive from Chicago to New York five years ago, explaining how Harry was making a pass at her while involved with her girlfriend. When Sally wanted to be friends with Harry, he said men and women couldn't be friends. So, Sally asks Joe if Harry is right. Joe says, no, even though he has no women friends, but is willing to get some if it's important to Sally. Before Sally gets on the plane, Joe tells her he will miss her and loves her. Sally loves hearing this from Joe, which prompts her to tell him she loves him. It appears Joe is fulfilling Harry's theory about male and female relationships, which is men are friends with men, women are friends with women, and women are the sexual objects of men's desires. The fact that Sally has not forgotten the past with Harry is a contrast to Harry who has forgotten the past with Sally. This narrative supports what Rubinfeld purports regarding traditional gender roles in the cold-hearted redemption plot, which is the deferential female challenging the traditional gender role of the dominant male (79).

The narrative tropes in Scene Five are Harry and Sally's encounter on the flight en route from New York to Washington, DC, and an elderly couple reminiscing how they met and married.

Scene Five has an interior setting—inside the airplane and the airport's moving sidewalk. Sally is in a middle seat in a crowded all-coach plane. She has the *New York Times* in her lap, but she's staring into the distance with a little smile on her face. It

appears she is thinking about Joe and he is in love with her. The stewardess taking drink orders interrupts her daydreaming. Sally goes into detail how she wants her Bloody Mary when Harry, who is in the row in back of her, pops up and says, “Did you look this good at the University of Chicago?” He seems to remember from the drink order he overheard that the woman in front of him is Sally Albright. When he gets, no, for a response, he mischievously asks if they ever—? The man on the aisle and next to Sally reacts to Sally and Harry’s conversation by offering his seat so they can sit together. Harry accepts the invitation before Sally can object. It appears Sally’s gaze is that Harry remembers who she is when she orders the Bloody Mary because it reminds him of the way she ordered the chef salad in the diner, but pretends not remembering that they never had sex, which confirms for Sally that he is still a sexual predator. Sally is de-emphasizing sex when Harry is being mischievous. They are seen as polar opposites in the neo-traditional subgenre put forth by McDonald (91). Harry’s gaze is that Sally is attractive; therefore, she is sexually desirable. And she still likes to control situations by the way she requests her drink order. Obviously, Harry is confirming Rubinfeld’s point about traditional gender roles being supported by the narrative (79).

When Harry and Sally sit next to each other on the plane, their conversation rehashes the past to explain changes in their life: Harry is no longer with Amanda because Sally was good friends with her; Sally is not marrying Joe, but Harry is marrying Helen Hillson, a lawyer, noting that she is keeping her name. Sally thinks Harry getting married is optimistic, and it’s nice to see him embracing life in this manner. But Harry’s candid confession to Sally that after sex he thinks about how long he has to lie and hold a woman, and all men feel that way, disturbs Sally, clearly showing she has a different

opinion about love and sex. For Sally, she connects love with making love. For Harry, he has no conception of love; there is only sex and pleasure. He does not know how to combine love with intimacy and sexuality. Having opposite points of view on this issue is a recurring neo-traditional trait.

However, after the plane lands and Harry and Sally are on a moving sidewalk, Harry has revised his theory of love and sex when he tells Sally, "Men and women can't be friends unless they're both involved with other people, then they can." Clearly, Sally is depicting self-reflexivity (a neo-traditional trait) as she converses with Harry, and she illustrates a neo-feminist perspective, which is a fashionable working-woman who has been intimate with men. However, five years later, she still can't tolerate Harry even with his amendment to the earlier rule about men and women and friendship. Moreover, she exhibits traditional family values when Harry tells her he is getting married. On the other hand, Harry does not seem to be getting married for the right reasons. Marriage solves the problem of being single, but he doesn't seem to see the connection between love and sex. If all he seeks is sexual pleasure, but feels guilty about how long to lie and hold a woman, then this guilt undercuts any sexual pleasure he may feel, making him a victim of his own sexual standards. Harry's marrying does support the traditional family and a patriarchal ideology, which may become a marital issue since he is marrying a professional woman who may not tolerate a male chauvinist.

In documentary fashion, an older Caucasian couple sits together on a loveseat looking straight at the camera, while the husband and wife take turns recounting their divorce after three years of marriage, then the husband's two marriages and divorces before they meet again at a funeral and a month later marry again, thirty-five years to the

day after their first marriage. They are real people, not actors, who found happiness when they re-married. It appears that the elderly couple's story parallels Sally's break-up with Joe and Harry's divorce from Helen in the next scene.

The narrative tropes in Scene Six are Sally's lunch with her friends, and Harry's revelation at a football game.

Scene Six has an exterior setting—outside seating at a restaurant, and Giants Stadium. Five years later, Sally is having lunch with her Manhattan women friends, Marie and Alice. Marie is single and Alice is married. They are discussing dates and available men: Marie learns from going through her married boyfriend's pockets that he and his wife bought a dining room table, so he is never going to leave her; Alice asks Marie why she can't find someone single as Sally did; Marie thinks Sally got the last good single man until Sally says she and Joe broke up on Monday; Alice asks Sally why she waited three days to tell them; Sally waited three days to tell her friends because she is not upset over the break-up, knowing she and Joe were growing apart; Marie is horrified, because Sally and Joe were a couple doing and going places together; Sally feels she deserves more than dates with Joe, because at thirty-one she wants marriage; Marie and Alice think Sally's "clock is ticking" and she wants a baby; Sally tells Marie and Alice the clock doesn't tick until thirty-six; Marie takes her rolodex out of her purse pulling out cards of supposedly single men for Sally, but learns from Sally some are already married; Sally tells Marie and Alice even though she is over Joe she is not ready to date because she is in a mourning period and she does not want a transitional man.

It's evident that the problem Marie and Sally have is not being married. The obstacle is not to be a single woman, so marriage is the most important accomplishment

for Sally and Marie. However, the solution to the problem involves the way they divide men into three categories: lovers (like Marie), transitional dates (when you are between lovers, which Sally does not want) and the man you love and marry (like Alice). Sally and Marie are attractive working-women who believe in the traditional family. Furthermore, in neo-traditional fashion, they are self-reflective, letting us know that marriage will make them happy and self-fulfilled women. Chastity is no longer a "feminine virtue" according to their classification of men, confirming their neo-feminist perspective on women's sexuality (Radner 11).

Harry and his friend, Jess, are at Giant Stadium. It's a fall football game, and they are casually dressed in jeans and windbreakers. It is in this crowded stadium that Harry tells Jess that his wife, Helen, has left him for a tax attorney, which he discovers following her and standing outside their building. Initially Helen talked about a trial separation, so they could still date, but Harry tells Jess that he got married so he could stop dating and he can't see dating his wife is an incentive when your wife is supposed to love you, which turns out she doesn't think she ever loved him. Even though he and Helen were happy, he always knew he would get divorced. Obviously, Harry always believes in the worst because he is insecure, suspicious, and pessimistic. When Jess tells him infidelity does not break up marriages, for it's just a symptom that something else is wrong, Harry is too self-absorbed to recognize his marital problem. We can surmise what is wrong with Harry's marriage, because his chauvinistic sexuality doesn't allow him to see the connection between love and sex. If all he seeks is sexual pleasure, and he is unable to give or show affection to his wife, he is making Helen unhappy in their relationship. Moreover, each wave coming through the stadium is a metaphor for the

stages of his broken marriage—Helen is leaving Harry; Helen wants a trial separation; Helen knew for a week that she was going to sublet an apartment; the trial separation is a lie because Helen is in love with someone else. Additionally, Harry needs a male friend to discuss his divorce, and Sally needs her female friends to tell about her break-up with Joe, making the break-up for both a recurring theme of the neo-traditional subgenre.

The narrative tropes in Scene Seven are Sally and Marie's conversation in the bookstore; Harry's presence at the bookstore; Sally and Harry becoming friends; an elderly couple reminiscing how they met; Sally and Harry's conversation about *Casablanca.*

Scene Seven has as an interior setting—a bookstore and a restaurant. Sally and Marie are standing and talking in the bookstore in a section called Personal Relationships. Marie is convinced her boyfriend will never leave his wife because she went into his briefcase and opened his American Express bill, seeing he spent $120. on a nightgown for his wife. Sally is holding *Smart Women, Foolish Choices* when Marie notices a man staring at Sally in the Personal Growth section. Sally looks and sees Harry and tells Marie she knows him and Marie would like him, because he is married. This is a cruel thing to say to a friend who wants her married boyfriend to leave his wife and marry her.

It's been six years since Sally saw Harry, so Marie thinks he may be divorced, suggesting that divorces are common in this time period, especially around Halloween—the pressure of the holiday is the onset of divorce. But as Sally tells Marie, Harry is obnoxious, Marie mentions the film *The Lady Vanishes*, and how she (actress) tells the man (actor) he is the most obnoxious and then they fall in love. We can predict from Marie's reference to the movie that Sally, who thinks Harry is obnoxious, will fall in love

with Harry. In the past Harry never remembers Sally, but this time he does, so Sally introduces Harry to Marie, who intuitively knows they should talk alone. As Harry and Sally reacquaint, they discover they are both single. Sally broke up with Joe and Helen is divorcing Harry.

Over tea at a restaurant with Harry, Sally goes into detail about marriage ruining a couple's relationship because they never have sex when the kids come along, for kids take every sexual impulse out of them. This is why Joe and Sally never married, but now Sally wants marriage and kids and a family when she realizes that she and Joe don't have sex on the kitchen floor or fly off to Rome on a moment's notice. Obviously, Sally's biological clock is ticking and she knows that a family will make her happy and self-fulfilled. Self-reflection is a neo-traditional trait, self-fulfillment is a neo-feminism quality, and the narrative supports the traditional family and gender roles.

Harry's divorce is making him a "softer" male, and Sally's break-up is making her a "softer" female. He is less intense and self-involved as we can tell while he walks and talks with Sally. They first talk about not liking each other. Then Harry thinks he is complimenting Sally when he tells her she is "softer." But Sally considers "softer" an insult even though it sounds like a compliment. Harry apologizes and she accepts his apology before asking him to have dinner with her sometime. This is Sally's way of accepting him as a friend. And for Harry, he feels great that Sally is his first attractive woman friend that he doesn't want sex with. Sally is using her "softer" side to learn how to be friends with Harry and be patient if her goal is to catch a man, get married, and have a family. Therefore, the narrative supports the role of the deferential female (Sally) while downplaying the traditional gender role of the dominant male (Harry), as noted by

Rubinfeld (79).

In documentary fashion, an older Caucasian couple sit together on a loveseat looking straight at the camera, while the husband and wife take turns discussing coincidences about their life—born in the same hospital seven days apart, grew up one block from each other, her family moved and his family moved, they worked in the same building where she was a nurse and he was a doctor, but they never met. Finally they met in an elevator in the Ambassador Hotel in Chicago. They are real people, not actors, who are happily married. It appears that the elderly couple's coincidental life encounters is preparing us for Harry and Sally's newfound friendship.

Harry is in his office staring at this moving bird phenomenon in a glass when he calls Sally and asks if she is sleeping. She isn't because she is watching *Casablanca*, so he asks what channel. Harry reminds Sally she said she would be happier with Victor Laszlo than Humphrey Bogart when they were driving to New York, but Sally denies saying that. The fact that Harry is calling Sally during the day is a phenomenon, because he is talking to a female friend. He has amended this theory that men have men friends to talk with.

Harry is in his nearly vacant apartment because of the divorce when we hear Sally and Harry's contrary conversation: Harry is not sleeping, getting up at four in the morning; Sally is sleeping even when going to bed at seven thirty at night; Harry is depressed because he is missing Helen; Sally is not depressed after breaking up with Joe; Sally sleeps on the whole bed; Harry sleeps on part of the bed like when he was married to Helen; Harry misses Helen; Sally does not miss Joe; Sally misses the idea of Joe; Harry misses the whole Helen. This narrative is a repetition of opposites, a neo-

traditional trait.

On a split screen, we see Harry and Sally in their own beds watching *Casablanca.* Harry thinks Ingrid Bergman is low maintenance, and Sally is high maintenance even though Sally thinks she is low maintenance. Harry's point is that Sally's detailed dietary modifications qualify her as high maintenance. Sally's point is that she wants food the way she wants it. Harry's comparison of Sally to Ingrid Bergman and his comment that the best last line of a movie ever is when Bogart says, "Louie, this is the beginning of a beautiful friendship," is a nostalgic neo-traditional trait, with the significance that Harry and Sally are having a relationship without sex, which is the beginning of a "beautiful friendship."

The narrative tropes in Scene Eight are Harry and Sally's dream conversation while walking; talking funny in the Metropolitan Museum; discussing new dating experiences in Harry's apartment.

Scene Eight has as an interior and exterior setting—city sidewalk, Metropolitan Museum, and Harry's apartment. Harry and Sally are walking in the city and discussing their dreams, which appear as a game, although different fantasy sex games for each. Harry is making love in the Olympics, receiving a 9.5 from all the judges for his mount and dismount. Sally's is about a faceless guy ripping off her clothes but nothing else happens. For the first time, Harry has found a member of the opposite sex (Sally) with whom he can share the most intimate of thoughts, because he is putting sex out of the situation, allowing himself to open up, and at the same time echo the lines from Casablanca, "The beginning of a beautiful friendship."

Inside the Egyptian section when Harry decides they are going to talk funny for

the rest of the day. Since it is Harry's idea, Sally imitates what Harry says. Then when he learns Sally has a date and she can't go to the movies with him later that night, he is disappointed, but understanding, because they are only friends. Clearly, their friendship is developing, because we can see that Harry enjoys spending time with Sally, his attractive female friend. Obviously, they are re-enacting the "beautiful friendship" in the classic romantic love story, *Casablanca*.

Harry and Sally are unrolling a new rug in Harry's apartment as they are talking about their first dates. Harry's was most uncomfortable and Sally's couldn't get worse. But, Harry thinks Sally's is a dream compared to his horror, but admits going to bed with her, which demonstrates Harry's theory about women and friendship: women you date and lay can never be your friend, and women you are friends with you can never lay. It seems the woman friend you don't lay (Sally) is the type Harry can open up to and express his feelings, because sex won't destroy the friendship. Thus, Harry and Sally depict two neo-traditional traits, self-reflection and a de-emphasizing of sex put forth by McDonald (91).

The narrative tropes in Scene Nine are Harry and Jess's conversation at batting practice; Harry and Sally's conversation about sex at Katz's delicatessen; Harry and Sally's first New Year's Eve party together.

Scene Nine has an interior and exterior setting—outside batting cage, Katz's delicatessen, and a New Year's Eve gala. Harry and Jess are hitting baseballs when Harry tells Jess that he enjoys his friendship with Sally. When Jess can't believe Harry isn't sleeping with Sally, Harry tells him he has never had a relationship with a woman without sex, so he thinks he is growing. He likes getting a female's point of view on

things, so they discuss the men she dates and the women he sees. He can tell her anything, like the woman he made "meow." And the best thing about their friendship is that he never has to lie because he doesn't have to think about getting her into bed. He can just be himself. Apparently, Sally is starting to tame Harry, because he never believed men and woman could talk like men talk to each other. The effect of self-reflection, a neo-traditional trait, is that Harry is enlightening Sally about male sexuality, and Sally is enlightening Harry about female sexuality.

Sally and Harry are in Katz's delicatessen eating lunch. Sally is trying to understand male sexuality when she asks Harry how he escapes immediately after he has sex with a woman. Harry's explanation is to fabricate different lies like he has an early meeting or a haircut or an early squash game, and gets away with the lie because they just met. This disgusts Sally, for he is a human affront to all women and she is a woman. The effect of her reaction gets Harry to admit he doesn't feel great about this, but no woman complains, because chauvinist Harry thinks he satisfied her. Sally challenges Harry on this point, saying women are successful players in the game of lying about sexuality, specifically faking an orgasm, and all men think it never happened to them, but all women have faked it. Harry doesn't seem to agree with Sally until she stares at Harry and demonstrates a wild fake orgasm, drawing the attention of everyone in the diner—waiters and customers, with an older woman customer telling her waiter she'll have what Sally's having. Obviously, Harry has learned from his friendship with Sally that women can lie about sexuality. Just like Harry can fake his pleasure to get away after sex with a woman, Sally can fake an orgasm, making a male think he made her sexually happy. This is a neo-feminist perspective on women's sexuality, which is the disappearance of chastity

as a "feminine virtue," consequently challenging a patriarchal ideology (Radner 11).

Ray Charles is singing "Winter Wonderland" as we see snowy Christmas scenes in New York. The setting is a neo-traditional trait, because the city is a place where romantic love happens (Jerymn 10). And the song is another neo-traditional trait evoking nostalgia and music from the past, because the female protagonist seeks old-fashioned romantic love (McDonald 87).

Sally and Harry are buying a Christmas tree for Sally's apartment. Then Sally and Harry are dancing at the New Year's Eve party to the sound of Harry Connick Jr. singing "I Could Write A Book," which is appropriate to the friendship developing between Harry and Sally. The fact that Harry tells Sally that they have a date next New Year's Eve if neither one is with somebody suggests that their friendship is growing and moving toward intimacy, especially when he glances at Sally and we see the beginning of a tender moment. But when the New Year arrives and everyone kisses to Louis Armstrong singing "Auld Lang Syne," it is an awkward moment for Harry and Sally who appear to want more than a platonic relationship. Instead of reacting to their emotions, they peck each other on the lips and wish each other a Happy New Year because they are afraid if sex enters the relationship they cannot be friends according to Harry's theory of female and male relationships. Sally looks interested in moving beyond friendship with Harry, but she must be patient if she wants to catch him on her terms, which is old-fashioned romantic love that leads to marriage and a family, a notion supporting traditional family values and a patriarchal ideology with a "softer" male (Rubinfeld 79).

The narrative tropes in Scene Ten are an elderly couple reminiscing how they met; Sally and Marie's conversation on the way to a restaurant; the double date; an

elderly couple reminiscing how they met; Harry reaction to meeting his ex-wife.

Scene Ten has an interior and exterior setting—city sidewalk, restaurant, and specialty store. In documentary fashion, an older Caucasian couple sits together on a loveseat looking straight at the camera. The wife begins telling us that they were both head camp counselors when they met at a social one night. It was when the husband introduced himself that she knew they would be husband and wife. They are real people, not actors, who are happily married. Their significance is that Harry and Sally are moving into a new phase of their relationship.

Early evening Sally and Marie are walking down the street on their way to a restaurant. Marie is telling Sally she sent herself a $60. arrangement of flowers, so Arthur would think she has a man in her life, but Arthur never noticed them because he never came over to her place. Instead, he went with his wife to a charity dinner she chaired. Sally confirms what Marie knows about Arthur. He is never going to leave his wife and she is wasting her time with a man that will never marry her. According to Harry's typology of women, Marie is a woman you lay. Sally and Marie's typology of men is that Arthur is a lover. Both women want a man they love and marry, an indication that they support traditional family values, and the neo-traditional trait, self-reflection.

Best friends Harry and Jess and Sally and Marie go on a double date—Harry with Marie and Sally with Jess. The idea is that best friends dating best friends will remain best friends. However, the dinner conversation brings together Jess and Marie, and we know a romance will take off. Marie makes Jess realize that the single life and work can be lonely. Jess makes Marie realize that he is what she has been looking for in a man. Like Harry and Sally's relationship, this is the beginning of a "beautiful friendship."

Self-reflection and friendship are recurring themes in this neo-traditional subgenre.

In documentary fashion, an older Asian couple sits together on a loveseat looking straight at the camera. Only the husband speaks. He tells how his arranged marriage to a woman he never saw prompts him to see what his future bride looks like. When he goes to her village and sees that she is attractive and ready for marriage, he happily marries her even though they were not supposed to meet until the wedding. They are real people, not actors, who are happily married for fifty-five years. It appears that the elderly couple is significant to how Harry perceives his ex-wife for the first time after the divorce.

Harry and Sally are shopping for Jess and Marie when Harry notices a karaoke machine. He starts singing "Surrey With The Fringe On Top." Sally joins in, but stops when Harry tells her his ex-wife Helen is coming toward him. It's the first time Harry has seen Helen since the divorce. Helen and Ira look sophisticated compared to Sally and Harry, who are silly goofing around with the karaoke machine. After they exchange introductions, Helen and Ira move on, leaving Harry in a vulnerable state. Even though he tells Sally he is fine, he isn't. He seems distressed by Helen who has rejected him for an attractive man. Harry reacts to Helen's rejection by telling Sally Helen looks weird and her legs look heavier. By making Helen sound unattractive, he is trying to resolve the hurt he feels. Obviously, Harry is having another growth experience regarding his relationship with Helen who we recall may never have loved him. As a friend, Sally doesn't like to see Harry hurt, and she is there to help him get over Helen.

The narrative tropes in Scene Eleven are Harry's meltdown, and the double date at Jess and Marie's apartment.

Scene Eleven has an interior and exterior setting—Jess and Marie's apartment,

and outside Jess and Marie's apartment. Harry and Sally arrive with an apartment-warming gift while Marie and Jess are in the process of deciding which of their things stays or goes. Marie hates Jess's large wagon wheel coffee table, so she asks Harry and Sally their opinion. It is at this moment that Harry reminisces about the first time he and Helen started out like Jess and Marie, but he goes berserk and shouts, "Six years later you wind up singing "Surrey With The Fringe On Top" in front of Ira. Obviously, Harry cannot hold back his feelings about the divorce. When Harry slams out the door, Sally tells Marie and Jess that he just ran into Helen.

While Harry is pacing in front of Jess and Marie's stoop, Sally comes down the steps to check on him. Her comment that he shouldn't express every feeling he has every moment he has them makes him angry, and judgmental of Sally, who he says never seems to get upset about anything like her break-up with Joe. And if she is so over Joe, why doesn't she see anyone, or sleep with anyone. Harry does not understand female sexuality. Sally tells him she will make love to someone when it is making love, not like Harry who seems to sleep around like he's out for revenge as a way of turning Helen into a faint memory. Clearly, Harry and Sally can speak about anything, and their growing friendship is obvious when Harry hugs and apologizes to Sally for his harsh words.

At Jess and Marie's now furnished apartment, a game of Win, Lose or Draw is in progress. Sally's team consists of Harry, Alice and Jess. Alice's husband, Gary, Marie and Julian (Sally's date) are part of the other team. Emily, Harry's date, isn't playing. Even though Marie and Alice think Julian is great and Emily is terrific, Harry and Sally think otherwise. Julian seems stuffy to Harry, and Sally thinks Emily is too young for Harry, which he realizes when he asks her where she was when Kennedy was shot and

she says, “Ted Kennedy was shot?” This critical analysis of their dates shows that Harry and Sally have a candid and open friendship, which is moving to another level.

The narrative tropes in Scene Twelve are Sally’s breakdown; the effects of Harry and Sally making love; the conversation between best friends.

Scene Twelve is an interior setting—Harry’s apartment, Sally’s apartment, and Jess and Marie’s apartment. Sally calls Harry when he is in bed reading. She needs him to come over, because Joe is getting married. After all, Sally is hysterically upset about losing Joe to marriage. She is incensed he chose a paralegal that works in his office over her. He just met her, so Sally thinks the paralegal should be the transitional person, not the one he loves and marries. Her self-reflection (a neo-traditional trait) is uttered to Harry, “He didn’t love me! I’m difficult. I am too structured and completely closed off. I drove him away.” And she confesses to Harry she wants marriage, so she can have a family.

Harry’s empathy for Sally and Sally’s need to be held leads to kisses and passionate love making. Initially after love-making, Sally has a dreamy-eyed look because she now feels the relationship is complete. However, Harry’s reaction changes everything. While Sally is smiling, Harry is staring straight ahead, because he realizes he just made love to a friend and we know he is thinking that sex destroys a friendship.

When Sally wakes up and the other half of her bed is empty, she turns and sees Harry getting dressed. When she asks where he’s going, he tells her he has to change clothes and go to work, and she has to go to work, too. But before he walks out, he invites her to dinner, and gives her a kiss. Sally, still in bed, looks like she is processing what has just happened between her and Harry. There is no exchange of I love you’s, so

it appears that Sally and Harry's love making may have compromised their friendship. In fact, they seem disconnected from each other, which is uncharacteristic of their relationship that has been open, honest, and conversational about everything.

Marie and Jess are sleeping in bed when each of their phones ring. Sally apologizes for calling so early, but she has to tell Marie she did a terrible thing after she found out Joe was getting married. Harry tells Jess he needs to talk. With two conversations going on at the same time with their best friends, we hear them say they did it. This is good news for Marie and Jess, because they think Harry and Sally belong together. When asked how was it? Harry and Sally say the during part was good, but afterwards, Harry tells Jess he felt suffocated, and Sally tells Marie it was like he disappeared. When invited for breakfast, Sally and Harry tell Jess and Marie they are coming down with something. We know doing it made Harry sick, because he can't have sex with a friend. The fact that he felt suffocated after sex indicates he is devoid of feelings for Sally. Unlike Sally, he doesn't understand that friends can be lovers. When Jess and Marie end their conversations with Harry and Sally, Marie and Jess embrace and kiss and know they never want to be out there again. They both bought into the ideology of love, and know that lovers who are friends have the best possible world when married.

The narrative tropes in Scene Thirteen are Sally and Harry's dinner conversation, and Harry and Jess's conversation.

Scene Thirteen is an interior setting and exterior setting—restaurant and Central Park. Sally and Harry are getting ready for dinner the day after they did it. As Sally is putting on make-up and Harry is taking a shower, we hear them thinking out loud, who will speak first about last night being a mistake. When Sally is the first to say it, Harry is

relieved, and then they both agree last night was sexually pleasurable, but it was a mistake. They eat in silence until Harry comments on how nice it is to sit with someone and not have to talk. Obviously, Harry doesn't know how to resolve his theory about friendship and sex. As a male chauvinist, he still has not learned how to combine love with intimacy and sexuality.

Jess and Harry are fast walking in Central Park while Harry expresses his feelings about the night they did it. Clearly, Harry tries to rationalize what happened by telling Jess when they went to bed, they heard each other's stories and they didn't know what they were supposed to do. Jess says, "Sure, Harry," because he doesn't agree with Harry's rationalization. In reality, Harry made love to Sally, and now they aren't friends anymore.

The narrative tropes in Scene Fourteen are Sally and Marie's conversation in the bridal shop, and Jess and Marie's wedding.

Scene Fourteen is an interior setting—bridal shop and wedding reception. Sally is sitting in a chair watching Marie's bridal fitting, so she asks if Harry is bringing anyone to the wedding. When Sally hears of Harry's new voluptuous girlfriend, her anxiety increases as she envisions her life alone without a lover or even a best friend. Then the conversation focuses on Marie and what Sally thinks about her dress. As best friends and her maid of honor, Sally is happy Marie is happy to get married. We see Sally's teary eyes, which suggest happiness for her best friend, but also for the loss of her relationship with Harry.

As Marie and Jess stand before a judge and exchange marriage vows, their best friends, Harry and Sally, are best man and maid of honor. But Sally and Harry are not

comfortable facing each other. Sally appears more upset than Harry about their break-up, and how he can't accept her ideology of love.

During the reception Harry approaches Sally who is uncomfortable, pretending not to be interested in conversing with him. Sally refuses to forgive him. After three weeks, Harry wants her to get past this, but when he accuses her of being a dog, she calls him a dog, for acting like what happened didn't mean anything. But for Sally it does mean something when the minute it happened he sprinted out the door, too self-involved to address the deficiencies of his friendship and sex theory. She can't go back the way it was even if they both agreed it was a mistake. However, when Harry follows Sally into the reception kitchen, the conversation intensifies and makes Sally furious to hear that he made love because he took pity on her. Sally's "fuck you" words and slap across the face stuns Harry and sends a clear message about their future. Perhaps the slap makes Harry realize he does not want to lose Sally.

Sally and Harry conveniently return to the reception when Jess is making a toast to Harry and Sally for making his marriage to Marie possible. Jess and Marie are testament that lovers who are friends have the best possible world, especially when they are married and can plan a lifelong future together. Clearly, Sally understands this, but Harry is still reluctant to surrender his freedom, promiscuity and independence to the demands of marriage.

The narrative tropes in Scene Fifteen are Sally avoidance of Harry; Harry's conversation with Jess about Sally; Sally's decision not to be a consolation prize; Harry's transformation.

Scene Fifteen has an exterior and interior setting—Christmas tree lot, Sally's

apartment, Harry's apartment, city sidewalk vendor, New Year's Eve party, and Washington Square and city blocks. Bing Crosby is singing "Have Yourself A Merry Little Christmas" while Sally is hauling a heavy Christmas tree home. She is not having a merry Christmas without Harry, so the heavy tree symbolizes her heavy heart. When she enters her apartment, and she hears Harry's message about the holiday season being a time for forgiveness and charity, and it would make him very happy if she would call him back, this is a reminder that Harry's missing in her life this Christmas and she can't go back to the way things were. When Sally doesn't return his call, he calls back saying he really wants to talk. Obviously, his separation from Sally has given him time to think and realize he wants Sally in his life. The problem is how to get her back.

Harry is with Jess at a hot dog stand, when he opens up to his best friend that Sally doesn't want to talk with him. But, he does not give up calling Sally. He tries singing "Call Me" into her phone, to get her to call back. We see her stop short of walking out the door to answer the phone. She is upset by the call, but when Harry says he called her to say he was sorry, her okay is followed by silence. The conversation ends with Sally hanging up after he tells her he is available for the Tyler's New Year's Eve party, which makes Sally feel like a consolation prize and she can't do this anymore. Harry has hurt her one too many times, so saying sorry isn't good enough.

Harry is alone in his apartment on New Year's Eve. We see him on his bed watching Dick Clark and we hear his thoughts and watch him miss the mini basketball hoop like he's missing Sally.

Jess and Marie and Sally and her date are dancing to "Don't Get Around Much Anymore" at a big New Year's Eve party. When Sally tells Jess and Marie, "I don't know

why I let you drag me to this," we can see her date's dancing is appalling —too many dips. This guy is history. No one can seem to replace Harry.

Harry decides to get some fresh air later New Year's Eve, and we hear his thoughts as he is trying to justify being alone. But in reality, Harry is lying to himself. He really wants to be with Sally. This is the climactic scene because Harry realizes he is attracted to the woman (Sally), who refuses his attentions, and he is in love.

Sally wants to leave the New Year's party because her date is not only an appalling dancer, but he also isn't funny. We can see that Sally has yet to find a replacement for Harry.

It's still New Year's Eve and Harry is walking along the same place in Washington Square where Sally dropped him off eleven years ago. We hear his thoughts as if he were speaking with Sally about his theory of friendship with females. When Harry's walk becomes a run, we hear Harry Connick Jr. singing "It Had to Be You." It's as if Harry's love for Sally needs a song. And he is figuratively running to Sally.

Sally wants out of the New Year's Eve party before midnight because she has no one to kiss. We can see Sally misses Harry, and she feels alone without him at her side.

Harry is still running, but looking for a cab to get quickly to Sally at the New Year's Eve party. Since he can't get a cab, he runs to the party, finds Sally as she is leaving, and tells her he loves her. But Sally rejects his offer and tells him, "I know it's New Year's Eve and you're lonely. But you can't show up and expect to make everything all right. It doesn't work that way." Sally is assertive and no shmuck. If Harry wants her, he has to demonstrate his love for her.

Harry convinces her he loves her by mentioning specific details he loves about

her, those high maintenance details like I love that it takes you an hour and a half to order a sandwich. "Auld Lang Syne" begins playing when he tells Sally he realized he wants to spend the rest of his life with her and he wants the rest of his life to start as soon as possible.

Sally retorts to Harry's declaration of love by telling him that the things he loves about her makes it impossible to hate him, but we know she hates him for breaking her heart with his ridiculous theory about woman and friendship and sexuality. When they kiss, we know the heroine's (Sally's) love changes the hero into a loving male. And Sally wins. Friends can be lovers, and lovers can be friends. Thus, the coldhearted Harry overcomes Sally's resistance and the plot resolution is that he wins her heart.

In documentary fashion, Sally and Harry are sitting on the loveseat and looking straight at the camera as they recount another way couples meet and marry—The first time Sally hated Harry, the second time Harry didn't remember Sally, and the third time they became friends for a long time. Then they weren't friends. And then they fell in love and got married three months later. Twelve years and three months later.

Sally tamed Harry and wins, because Harry accepts Sally's position that friends can be friends without being lovers, but lovers who are friends have the best life, especially when they marry and plan a family, which supports a patriarchal ideology and traditional family values (Rubinfeld 79). Moreover, even if neo-feminism challenges a patriarchal ideology, it does not discourage motherhood; it displaces the centrality it held in the early twentieth century and nineteenth-century accounts of feminine self-fulfillment (Radner 11).

When Harry Met Sally grossed $92.8 million in 1989 (Box Office Mojo). Over

the years this feel-good relationship movie has been popular because it speaks the truth about men and women, and many in the audience can relate to Harry and Sally as real people they know. For example, Harry is no Rock Hudson; short with a receding hairline, he is pessimistic about life and self-absorbed, but he is sweet and caring, especially when he realizes that his theory about women, friendship, and sexuality is deficient, and gets his priorities straight in time for a happy ending. On the other hand, Sally is Harry's opposite. She's optimistic and pretty but no Doris Day in that she is neurotic, insecure, and vulnerable, characteristics many women can relate to. In fact, Nora Ephron, the screenwriter, said "there is no real plot, so it entirely depends on your caring for those two [Harry and Sally] people" (Tan).

Harry and Sally's love story supports The American Film Institute's definition of "romantic comedy" as a genre in which development of a romance leads to comic situations that promise hope for men and women who are alone and looking for the right man or woman to marry. However, this study's focus is to convey from the film's scenes how women are portrayed in a society that supports a patriarchal ideology and traditional family values in the face of the neo-traditional traits put forth by McDonald, and the neo-feminism traits noted by Hilary Radner. To accomplish this goal, the film was analyzed for its visual characteristics, narrative patterns, plots, themes, tone, mood, and point of view using primarily three film scholars, Tamar Jeffers McDonald, Mark Rubinfeld, and Hilary Radner. Another film scholar is Louis Giannetti, offering considerations about set and costume, which are visual characteristics important to the portrayal of women who are Caucasian, twenty-something at the start of the film and thirty-something at the end of the film, attractive, educated, professional, and moneyed to be able to live alone and

have the means to be fashionable and social with friends. The "beauty and goodness" stereotype put forth by social psychologists Stephen Smith, William McIntosh and Doris Bazini does not apply to all physically attractive individuals in terms of their moral goodness and romantic activity such as Marie and Sally who have sex before marriage, which clearly reflects the disappearance of chastity as a "feminine virtue" in this time period (Radner 11).

A patriarchal society is depicted in this film, which means women recognize that what matters most are men, marriage, and motherhood. Marie and Sally divide males into three categories: lovers, transitional dates, and the man you love and marry. Not being single is the most important accomplishment for them. When Marie marries Jess, she no longer has to fight for a man like when she was with Arthur, a married man, who was content being her lover. When Sally breaks up with Joe because he does not want to marry her and have children, Harry is destined to be with Sally if we think about him being the object of her gaze the three times they meet: When they leave for New York in 1977, she honks to get his attention. Five years later at the airport, she sees Harry before he sees her. And in the bookstore with Marie, Sally sees Harry before he sees her. Moreover, the opening song "Our Love is Here to Stay" supports their destiny to be together.

Even though Nora Ephron indicates this film does not have a plot, there is a plot. Mark Rubinfeld contends the pursuit plot is seen from the male's point of view in this narrative structure. It is a story about a man (Harry) who does not use force to control and/or possess a woman (Sally). Instead, he uses subtle manipulation along with pity and guilt. The quest is for Harry to win Sally's heart. The obstacles are being single versus

being married; sexuality and women's orgasms; love, sexuality, and friendship. However, the pursuit plot is combined with the coldhearted redemption plot and it is delivered from a male point of view while emphasizing female emotions. Moreover, the hero (Harry) of the coldhearted redemption plot is bitter and incapable of love. He is scared of commitment and struggles to say, "I love you." What he needs is a redemptive heroine (Sally) or "good deferrer." She is like a "good wife," respectful and obedient and the hero's lifeline (14; 23; 27; 31). But the plot seems to be secondary to spectacle. That is, the spectacle, consisting of the setting, costume, make-up, and stock characters (Cohen 79), reveals the film's neo-traditional traits, which are a mood of imprecise nostalgia, a more vague self-referentiality, a de-emphasizing of sex, and recurring themes, visuals, and music that signify their romantic comedy status (McDonald 91). In addition to the neo-traditional traits, a neo-feminist perspective on women's sexuality is present. Film scholar Hilary Radner purports that the neo-feminist is a working girl, who is a fashionable consumer, and open to premarital sex. Romance is a significant theme and the "do-over" is the resolution to insurmountable problems (3).

Because Hollywood was concerned with production numbers, the romantic comedy exploited the neo-feminism model of feminine identity by incorporating elements of the friendship film with Sally and her friends, Marie and Alice. Marie is single and with a married man. Sally is living with Joe until she breaks up with him because she wants to get married and start a family and he doesn't. The women talk to air some of their relationship issues and give caring advice to one another, like Marie needs to break up with her married boyfriend who is never going to leave his wife. And Marie has a Rolodex of available men for Sally who has broken up with her boyfriend. Friends

listen and support each other and help the neo-feminist, single or married, achieve her identity to have self-fulfillment (Radner 11).

Sally's assertiveness is attractive to the female audiences because she tries to set Harry straight on female sexuality when she says all women fake orgasms, and she does not easily forgive Harry for breaking her heart. She makes Harry demonstrate his love for her and agree that she is right about friends being lovers, and lovers being friends. Thus, Harry gets Sally back when he surrenders his freedom, promiscuity and independence to marry Sally. In the end, Harry and Sally's love story is about boy gets girl, boy loses girl, and boy gets girl back. The overriding theme is that females seek self-fulfillment through marriage.

The success of *When Harry Met Sally* led to the rise of other neo-traditional/neo-feminism films, with the heroine, Meg Ryan. For example, *You've Got Mail* (1989) has neo-traditional/neo-feminism traits, and employs romantic comedy tropes such as falling over, slapstick, an adversarial relationship which turns to love, and masquerade (McDonald 118)). The narrative structure is a pursuit plot combined with a coldhearted redemption plot from a male point of view and two foil plots, the dweeb and bitch. In the coldhearted redemption plot, the hero (Joe) is bitter and incapable of love. He needs a redemptive heroine (Kathleen). In the dweeb plot, the heroine (Kathleen Kelly) has to choose between two men (Frank Navasky—newspaper columnist boyfriend and Joe Fox—executive in his family's bookstore chain) who love her or profess to love her. The narrative pits the hero (Joe) against a romantic foil (Frank) who is such a dweeb or a pinhead that the heroine's choice is "no choice" (Rubinfeld 45). The bitch foil plot requires the hero (Joe) to choose between two women (Kathleen and Patricia Eden—

Joe's publishing executive girlfriend) who love him or profess to love him. This plot works to ensure that whatever anger, resentment, and hatred women may feel toward patriarchy it is channeled toward other women. Any woman who is not nice gets to be treated and punished like a dog or bitch (52). Thus, the prick and dweeb foils empower the hero (Joe) while the bitch foil belittles the female. Furthermore, Rubinfeld points out the love story feeds off the coldhearted redemption plot and the foil plot "serves as the icing on the cake" (61). Obviously, *You've Got Mail* supports traditional gender roles and family values and a patriarchal ideology. Some other popular neo-traditional/neo-feminist romantic comedies starring Meg Ryan are *Sleepless in Seattle* (1993) and *French Kiss* (1995).

In *Sleepless in Seattle,* neo-traditional/neo-feminism traits are present as well as the romantic comedy tropes falling over, slapstick, and meet cute girl (McDonald 118)). The narrative structure is a pursuit plot combined with a brokenhearted redemption plot from a male point of view and a dweeb foil plot. The hero (Sam Baldwin) in the brokenhearted redemption plot is "more loveless than heartless; his wounds stem from loneliness (his wife died), not bitterness." He wants commitment, but he is scared he will never get the chance to say, "I love you." He needs a heroine (Annie Reed) to fulfill his needs and be there for him because she feels sympathy for him (Rubinfeld 27-28). In the dweeb plot, the heroine (Annie Reed) has to choose between two men (Walter or Sam) who love her or profess to love her. The narrative pits the hero (Sam) against a romantic foil (Walter) who is such a dweeb or schmo that the heroine's choice is "no choice" (Rubinfeld 45). The dweeb foil (Walter) empowers the hero (Sam). For example, Annie is engaged to wimpy Walter, who she thinks is "Mr. Right" until she hears Sam's voice

on the radio without ever meeting him to realize he is "Mr. Right." When Annie gets around to telling Walter (the dweeb foil) there is someone else, his response is like "Aw, Shucks," which empowers Sam. Furthermore, *Sleepless in Seattle* supports traditional gender roles and family values and a patriarchal ideology.

According to film scholar, Mark Rubinfeld, *French Kiss*'s narrative structure is a pursuit plot combined with a coldhearted redemption plot from a male point of view and a dweeb foil plot (161). In the coldhearted redemption plot, the hero (Luc) is bitter and incapable of love. He needs a redemptive heroine (Kate). In the dweeb plot, the heroine (Kate) has to choose between two men (Charlie and Luc) who love her or profess to love her. The narrative pits the hero (Luc) against a romantic foil (Charlie) who is such a dweeb that the heroine's choice is "no choice" (45). When Kate is asked by Luc (hero) to describe how she felt when she first met Charlie she says, "It wasn't exactly a thunderclap or lightning bolt. It was more like . . . like . . . like . . . ." Sensing Kate's struggle to finish the description, the hero (Luc) interjects, "Drizzle?" We know the passionless Charlie helped the hero (Luc) win Kate. This film employs the neo-traditional/neo-feminism traits, traditional gender roles, and family values, and a patriarchal ideology. Finally, how women are portrayed in the aforementioned movies must take into consideration the visual characteristics, narrative patterns, plots, themes, tone, mood, point of view which reflect the ideology of the time period. Like *When Harry Met Sally*, the overriding them is that females seek self-fulfillment through marriage.

CONCLUSION

This study examined how women are portrayed in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally,* two iconic romantic comedies from different time periods, 1959 and 1989, respectively. The analysis relies primarily on three film scholars, Tamar Jeffers McDonald, Mark Rubinfeld, and Hilary Radner. Their scholarly insights, and those of other film pundits have been instrumental in showcasing the similarities and differences among the women portrayed in these love stories, which pit women against men, and show how girl gets boy, boy loses girl, and girl gets boy back. Obviously, *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally* highlight different time periods, reflecting a society's desires, anxieties, and assumptions, and different romantic comedy subgenres, which will enlighten readers as they discover more differences and similarities delivered by visual characteristics, narrative patterns, plots, themes, tone, mood, point of view and ideology portraying women.

The romantic comedies *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally* have the same overriding theme—the females seek self-fulfillment through marriage. In order to ascertain how the overriding theme and culture of each time period affects each romantic comedy, it is important to examine the narrative elements of character, setting, plot, themes, tone, mood, and point of view to reach the resolution.

Character

The female characters in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally* have the same goals and fears. Jan Morrow tells us that she wants marriage in Scene One when she sings about the boy she will marry someday, someway, some time in "Pillow Talk." Jan has dated a lot of nice men, but only one meets her criteria for marriage, Rex Stetson. We

know Jonathan Forbes, her client, thinks Jan is the sweetest, loveliest, and most talented person he has met, and he wants to marry her, because there is nothing so wonderful, so fulfilling, as coming home to the same woman every night. Nevertheless, Jan cannot marry Jonathan, for his drawbacks are being pretentious, not knowing how to romance a woman, and his kiss doesn't make her "hit the moon." As for Brad Allen, she despises him. Because of the party line they share, she knows he is morally corrupt, describing him as a sex maniac to the phone company assistant manager, Mr. Conrad. Besides being a sex maniac, Jan thinks Brad is rude and disrespectful to her. All these negative characteristics make Brad unsuitable for marriage, especially since we know he is anti-marriage and he wants sex with girls before marriage.

However, when Brad masquerades as Rex Stetson, Jan is mesmerized by his looks, gentleman-like behavior, honesty, and humility. We know the more Brad masquerades as Rex the more he sheds his moral corruption for moral righteousness. But, his moral goodness becomes an issue for Jan when she realizes she loves Rex and wants him to prove his manhood. When he does, his kiss makes her "hit the moon," which means Rex is the man she loves and wants to marry.

Brad's lie turns to truth when Jan discovers Rex is Brad and Brad discovers he loves Jan. Because Brad's masquerade breaks Jan's heart, he loses her. To win Jan back he takes assertive action with Jan, which proves he loves her and wants to marry her. Jan's character and her interaction with Brad and Jonathan support traditional gender roles and family values, and a patriarchal ideology in 1959 society.

The title *Pillow Talk* does not reveal whom the film is about. But, *When Harry Met Sally,* the title tells us that the film is about Sally and Harry. However, we

don't know from the title that Harry and Sally's relationship evolves over a twelve your period. Like Jan Morrow and Brad Allen, Harry and Sally dislike each other when they first meet in 1977 while sharing the driving from Chicago to New York, and in 1982 on a flight en route from New York to Washington, DC. It's six years later when Sally sees Harry in a bookstore and discovers that they are both single, making this encounter the beginning of a "beautiful friendship," the best last line of a movie ever for Harry because he is comparing Sally to Ingrid Bergman and himself to Humphrey Bogart in *Casablanca*. The friendship with Sally is special, because he can be honest expressing his feelings on any subject he would discuss with his best friend, Jess. But when Harry and Sally have sex, the "softer" Harry becomes distant and disconnected, so Sally breaks up with Harry because he broke her heart and he still hasn't learned to combine love with intimacy and sexuality. Like Brad, Harry has to convince Sally he loves her. Instead of taking Brad's assertive approach, Harry recites specific details he loves about Sally and tells her he wants to spend the rest of his life with her. In both films it's the last scene when Brad and Harry declare their love, embrace and kiss their ladies, and relinquish their bachelorhood for marriage. Sally's character and interaction with Harry supports traditional gender roles and family values, and a patriarchal ideology even though society in 1989 condoned premarital sex reflecting a neo-feminist perspective on women's sexuality, which is the disappearance of chastity as a "feminine virtue;" therefore, challenging a patriarchal ideology (Radner 11).

Brad and Jan and Harry and Sally do not simply fall in love. Girl gets boy, boy loses girl, and boy gets girl back with marriage and the promise of a family. Sally wants what Jan wants, marriage and a family, which will make them happy and self-

fulfilled women. Both women are patient about catching the right man to marry and have a family. For Jan, the man must be attractive, intelligent, moneyed, respectful, honest, unpretentious, and romantically unpredictable; his kiss must make her "hit the moon." For Sally, lovers who are friends have the best life, especially when they marry and plan a family. Clearly, Jan wants marriage before sex, and Sally wants marriage having had premarital sex. Sally's character challenges yet supports the patriarchal ideology because in 1989 audiences wanted films to return to older conventions.

What Jan needs are girlfriends, which are absent from the film. If she had girlfriends, married or single, their conversations and advice to each other about male and female relationships would contribute to self-fulfillment outside of marriage. Moreover, the self-fulfillment gained with friends should transfer to self-fulfillment in marriage. We know the only person that acts as a friend to Jan is her maid, Alma. Alma is not a peer. She is an older woman that has been intimate with men; therefore, her advice to Jan is to pursue Rex, so Jan knows what she has been missing without sex. Jan follows Alma's advice to some degree. She gets Rex, who transforms wolfish Brad, but she does not let her emotions affect her morality. She wants marriage before sex. In contrast to Jan are Brad's girlfriends who are willing to be seduced by Brad, thinking their femininity and sexiness will convince him to give up his bachelorhood for matrimony. Like Jan, these minor female characters do not have friends in the film. They only interact with Brad and Jan who is a possible threat to their relationship with Brad. Furthermore, they do not support traditional gender roles and family values in the 1959 time period.

On the other hand, *When Harry Met Sally,* Sally has girlfriends. At the start of the movie, we are introduced to Amanda, a University of Chicago friend, who introduced her

boyfriend Harry to Sally, so they could drive to New York together. After college, Sally's Manhattan friends are Marie and Alice. Marie is single and Sally's best friend, and Alice is her married friend. With the advent of the birth control pill in 1960, women did not fear pregnancy, so virginity was not an issue in male and female relationships. We know Jan is a virgin (no birth control pill in 1959), but Sally and Marie are not virgins since they talk about their relationships with men. Marie has a married lover, Arthur, who will never leave his wife, and Sally was living with Joe until they broke up because Joe did not want to marry Sally. Moreover, we know Sally has had other relations with men when she tells Harry about the great sex she had with Shel Gordon, whom they both know from college, and in Scene Two when she tells Harry and the entire diner she had lots of great sex, which challenges a patriarchal ideology as she represents the neo-feminist perspective on women's sexuality in 1989.

We learn a lot about Sally and her New York friends from listening to their concerns about men and their advice for each other in relationships. Some examples are these: In Scene Six, Alice thinks Marie should ditch the married man for a single man and she is upset that Sally waited three days to tell her friends about her break-up with Joe; Marie is horrified that Sally and Joe broke up because they were a couple and going places together; Sally tells Marie and Alice that she wanted more than dates with Joe—marriage; Alice and Marie think Sally wants a baby; Marie pulls out a rolodex of supposedly single men to help Sally find "the right man;" Sally tells her friends she doesn't want to date because she is in a mourning period and she does not want a transitional man.

Similar to Jan, Marie and Sally feel marriage is the most important

accomplishment. How they find "the right man" differs. Jan uses descriptive words to state her criteria for the ideal man, but Sally and Marie categorize men as lovers (like Marie), transitional dates (when you are between lovers, which Sally does not want), and the man you love and marry (like Alice).

Jan, Sally and Marie are attractive working- women who believe in the traditional family and they are letting us know that marriage will make them happy and self-fulfilled women. In both time periods, as noted by Mark Rubinfeld, women supported traditional gender roles, family values, and a patriarchal ideology (79) even though Marie and Sally challenge the ideology by having premarital sex before marriage (Radner 11).

Jan's assertiveness is attractive to female audiences because she stands up to Brad who is impudent and morally corrupt. She takes action against Brad's abuse of the party line. In spite of her assertiveness, articulation, and professional appearance, the phone company only agrees to send out an inspector, a woman inspector, who can't handle Brad's smooth talk and charisma. Unlike Jan, the phone inspector is vulnerable to Brad's seductive persona. Also, unlike Jan are Brad's girlfriends who allow themselves to be sexually exploited. They let their emotions obscure their sense of morality. Jan is clever, righteous, and confident to uncover the ulterior motive of men who use women for their personal gain.

In the same way as Jan, Sally is assertive, but for different reasons. In Scene Two when Sally and Harry are in the diner, Sally reacts to Harry telling her she has never had great sex by saying she has had a lot of great sex, and in long lasting relationships (marriage) sex is not enough. We know Sally and Marie believe a woman must learn to be friends with men, and be patient if they want to catch "the right" man. Jan is a virgin,

so this would not be a conversation she would have with Brad or Rex.

In Scene Three, Sally reacts negatively to Harry's comment that she is attractive, telling him he is "coming on" to her when he is involved with her friend, Amanda. She makes it clear to Harry that she is not going to bed with him. We know Sally thinks Harry is a sexual predator like Brad Allen. Also, Sally is assertive by taking a stand on friendship between males and females, which Jan never does. Harry thinks males can't be friends with females because they are the sexual objects of men's desires. Sally disagrees with Harry because she has male friends where sex is not an issue.

In Scene Six, Sally and Marie are assertive that marriage will be an important accomplishment, for they believe like Jan that it will make them happy and self-fulfilled.

In Scene Seven, when Sally and Harry are having tea in a restaurant, Sally explains why she and Joe never married—When the kids come along, they take every sexual impulse out of a husband and wife. But now Sally tells Harry she wants marriage and kids and a family. Moreover, she tells Harry she does not consider being described as "softer" or "high maintenance" a compliment. For Sally, "softer" is an insult, and she is not "high maintenance" because she wants food the way she wants it. Compared to Harry's insults, Brad's are meaner when in Scene Four he tells Jan she has "bedroom problems." The diatribe that goes on between Jan and Brad shows that he is insolent and disrespectful to Jan, which carries over into Scene Five when Jan interrupts his conversation to tell him he is on her phone time.

On a final note about the characters, the language differs in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally*. In *Pillow Talk* the language is romanticized, making the characters less realistic. Some examples are the way Eileen, Yvette, and Marie, Brad's girlfriends,

converse with Brad, and the unrealistic way Jan thinks love comes when a man's kiss makes her "hit the moon." The instances of realistic language are related to Jan's untraditional gender role in a patriarchal 1959 society. When Jan is assertive, she sounds realistic in the following ways: taking action against Brad's abuse of the party line; standing up to Brad's insolent and disrespectful behavior when she tells him she likes living alone and she doesn't have "bedroom problems;" refusing to accept Brad's apology for his rudeness and abuse of the party line; reacting to Tony Walter's primitive behavior. Thus, traditional gender roles are related to romanticized language and untraditional gender roles are related to realistic language, which limits the film's audience appeal and timelessness. On the other hand, the language in *When Harry Met Sally* is realistic, making us care for the characters. Because the dialogue is witty, the one-liners and quotes memorable, this film is worthy of multiple viewings across time periods. Some instances of the memorable language are these: "Great! A woman friend. . . . You know you may be the first attractive woman I have not wanted to sleep with in my entire life;" "No man can ever be friends with a woman that he finds attractive. He'll always want to have sex with her;" "You say things like that and you make it impossible for me to hate you;" "I came here tonight because when you realize you want to spend the rest of your life with somebody, you want the rest of your life to start as soon as possible;" "I'll have what she's having"—the immortal line uttered by an older woman customer in Katz's Deli.

Setting

The setting in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally* is the same with regards

to the location—New York City. In fact, the cinematic portrayal of the city is where romantic love happens, making the city a guarantee for a successful love story (Jerymn 10). By referencing the city using visual elements, filmmakers as noted by McDonald create a romantic mood. Setting is a visual characteristic. Real details of everyday life are used to stage the action and the way it is photographed. In *Pillow Talk,* the setting is part of spectacle, which reveals the film's themes—masquerade, hierarchy of knowledge, and the reversions and inversions of the natural order (McDonald 45); therefore, it is secondary to the plot, which is primary (Mulvey qtd. in Cohen 79). On the other hand, *When Harry Met Sally,* the setting, which is part of spectacle, is primary to the plot, because it reveals the themes put forth by McDonald —a mood of imprecise nostalgia, self-referentialism and a de-emphasizing of sex, (91).

In *Pillow Talk,* the setting of this romantic comedy shows that the male and female characters have a material presence and relationship to things. Their clothes, accessories, and furniture are as Cohen points out aesthetic elements, which are not connected to sexual desirability. Instead, they empower the women characters (81-83). For example, when Jonathan describes Jan to Brad, he does not comment on her couture wardrobe. He points out her desirable qualities when he says Jan is the sweetest, loveliest, and most talented person he has met. Besides Jonathan, her boss, Mr. Pierot, and her client Mrs. Walters respect Jan's talent.

In *When Harry Met Sally*, the setting, which is part of spectacle, is primary to the plot. It is in the places the women and male characters habitué— the car, diner, La Guardia airport, restaurants, Giant Stadium, bookstore, apartments, museum, Katz's deli, Central Park, city streets, New Year's Eve party—that we experience what matters most

about the film, which is the witty dialogue and memorable one-liners. The realistic dialogue, spoken in propitious or inauspicious settings, makes us care about the characters, especially Sally and Harry.

The interior and exterior elements of the setting in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally a*re similar yet different. Similar to both films is the women and men are Caucasian, twenty-something and/or thirty-something, attractive, educated, professional, and moneyed to be able to live alone and have the means to be fashionable. Unlike *Pillow Talk*, the characters in *When Harry Met Sally* are social with friends since much of the conversations involve Harry, Sally, and their friends in different settings. Where the setting differs more in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally* is with the apartment décor. Jan, Brad, Brad's girlfriends, and Jonathan have professionally decorated apartments to create either a masculine or feminine milieu. In fact, Jan's apartment depicts a "clean" feminine romantic atmosphere for a "good" career driven girl who wants marriage before sex. By contrast, Harry, Sally, Marie and Jess have apartments that are not professionally decorated. We see Sally helping Harry decorate his apartment after his divorce from Helen, and Jess and Marie, who are moving in together, doing the same. Their life style requires money, but it is not as sophisticated a lifestyle as Jan's, Brad's or Jonathan's. Obviously, the setting is where we witness dialogue as an adjunct to the characters' style (clothes, accessories, and home furnishings), serving as permission for women to be themselves or self-expressive (Cohen 85-87).

Tone -Mood - Point of View - Theme

In *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally,* the dialogue (word choice) of the characters, the setting, and the plot reveal each film's tone and mood, which delivers the

male and female gaze. In a film, the tone is the screenwriter's attitude toward the subject matter, and the mood is the feeling the screenwriter intends the viewer to experience. In both instances, word choice determines the tone and mood, as well as the male and female gaze, which is inferred by the viewer.

In *Pillow Talk* Jan is irritated by Brad's abuse of the party line they share so she takes serious action by reporting Brad to the phone company. Her assertive ness is attractive to female audiences who like seeing a woman challenge a patriarchal society. Jonathan's persistence at winning Jan's heart is met with rejection three times. Jan is straightforward when she tells him she does not love him, and we know why. She is the type of woman who is seeking romance with imagination while "hitting the moon" as confirmation that she has found the man she loves and wants to marry. Jan's discovery that Rex is Brad infuriates her and breaks her heart. She wants nothing to do with Brad until he takes action proving he loves her. Jan's righteous stand against Brad sends the message that he deserves to be rejected. Clearly, Jan delivers a female gaze for both genders in the audience to better understand the "strong" female character as portrayed by Jan who is realistic when confronting conflict, and a "softer" female character as portrayed by Jan when she unrealistically succumbs to a dominant male, which supports a patriarchal ideology.

In *When Harry Met Sally,* Sally is a woman with goals, ambition, and opinions that represent her convictions regardless of what the opposite sex thinks.
This portrayal of Sally is presented by showing Harry as having an opposite persona. Specifically, Sally is optimistically happy and Harry is pessimistically morose. The contrasting personalities seem purposeful in that Sally represents the more mature

character. Her introspection about male and female love relationships is logical compared to Harry's. If men have the power over women to provide great sex, and they think that is all a women needs for a long lasting relationship, females have issue with this kind of male gaze, because the female gaze is that intimacy between a man and a woman requires more than great sex. In fact, Harry learns from Sally by the end of the film that lovers who are friends have the best possible world when married. Moreover, Sally, representing a woman's influence on a man shows how a man like Harry can shed his darker side and embrace life and its challenges more optimistically. This aspect of a woman does not support the traditional gender role of a patriarchal society. However, when Sally achieves her important goal of marriage, she is supporting family values, which supports a patriarchal ideology. The documentaries of the older couples point out that people meet and marry under a variety of circumstances just like Harry and Sally. As we witness in the film, Harry and Sally hated each other the first time, the second time Sally was relieved that Harry did not remember her, and the third time they experienced the joy of being friends, the disappointment of not being friends, and the gift of love and marriage and the promise of home and family.

By examining the music in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally* the viewer experiences tone and mood as the music affects the characters in different settings with the action of the plot. What affects the tone and mood in a piece of music is the melody (tune of the song), harmony (supports the melody and gives the music texture or mood), and tempo (how fast or slow is the music) of the song, which implies an emotional response. However, whatever a listener perceives in the music is what the music is expressing in a personal and individualistic way.

The screenwriters in *Pillow Talk,* Stanley Shapiro and Maurice Richlin, and in *When Harry Met Sally,* Nora Ephron*,* use the tone and mood of the music to move forward the portrayal of women. When Jan is singing "Pillow Talk" at the start of the film, her tone is introspective and her mood is dreamy, letting us know that she desires marriage and believes in traditional gender roles and family values. On the other hand, Brad's girlfriends implore Brad to play "Inspiration," which tells us they feel romantic and passionate and vulnerable around charming Brad and will succumb to sex, hoping to convince him to give up bachelorhood for marriage. Jan is fun and happy singing "Roly Poly" with Rex, the pianist, and the Hidden Door customers. As we see her spend more time with Rex, she is changing from an all-serious career woman to a woman who realizes what she is missing in life—a man like Rex. And when Jan sings "Possess Me," she is relinquishing her "good girl" image for desiring sex with Rex, which is an untraditional gender role in 1959 society. Consequently, the mood and tone depicted by the music supports the themes of masquerade, hierarchy of knowledge, and the reversal of the "natural" order put forth by Tamar Jeffers McDonald, and a pursuit plot where girl gets boy by allowing the hero (Brad) to win her (Jan's) heart.

When Louis Armstrong sings, "Love is Here to Stay" at the start of *When Harry Met Sally,* we are sentimentally reassured that Harry and Sally will fall in love and have a long lasting marriage. But we do not know to what degree Sally, representing the female gender, contributes to this endeavor. At the end of the road trip from Chicago to New York, "Let's Call the Whole Thing Off" is significant from the female perspective. Sally strongly objects to Harry's theory about male-female relationships and sexuality. Her assertiveness reflects the neo-traditional trait, reflexivity or self-referentialism,

because she defends her point of view, making Harry stubborn about not being her friend. Sally's opinion on this matter depicts Harry as a haughty and cold man because Sally's logical, self-assured and emphatic viewpoint challenges Harry's chauvinistic patriarchal attitude, making us support the female gaze instead of the male gaze. Harry's separation from Sally has given him time to think and he wants to get back with her by singing, "Call Me" into her phone. We understand he is lonely and his cheerful tone and warm, welcoming mood, does not deserve Sally's forgiveness. She is smart and perceptive that Harry has not changed yet. Loneliness is not a good enough excuse to take him back. She wants more than a lover. Audiences, male and female, can learn a didactic lesson from the character types Sally and Harry portray. Sally is the type of woman who challenges a relationship to get what she wants. And if Harry loves her he is going to have to let her win at this game. At the end of the film, Harry is running to Sally who is at a New Year's Eve party. It's as if Harry's Love for Sally needed the song "It Had to Be You." The song makes us feel and Sally feel Harry's passion, romance, love, and energy. Hence, the mood and tone depicted by the music supports a mood of imprecise nostalgia, a mood of self-referentialism, and a de-emphasizing of sex as noted by Tamar Jeffers McDonald, and a pursuit plot where girl gets boy by allowing the hero (Harry) to win her (Sally's) heart.

With *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally* expressing the same overriding theme—the females seek self-fulfillment through marriage, the screenwriters Stanley Shapiro and Maurice Richlin, and Nora Ephron, respectively, use the tone and mood of the music differently and similarly. In *Pillow Talk* the mood and tone depicted by the music supports the themes of masquerade, hierarchy of knowledge, and the reversal of

the "natural" order put forth by Tamar Jeffers McDonald. On the other hand, *When Harry Met Sally* the mood and tone depicted by the music supports a mood of imprecise nostalgia, a mood of self-referentialism, and a de-emphasizing of sex as noted by Tamar Jeffers McDonald. Similarly, both films are pursuit plots where girl gets boy by allowing the hero (Brad and Harry) to win her (Jan's and Sally's) heart. However, the pursuit plot in *Pillow Talk* is primary in that it drives the narrative structure and in *When Harry Met Sally* the plot is s secondary to spectacle—the setting, costume, make-up, the recurring themes, visuals, and music.

Plot -Theme

The pursuit plot functions differently in *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally*. In *Pillow Talk,* the plot problem is sharing a party line, which was common in 1959. The narrative structure is the pursuit plot consisting of a quest, obstacle, and resolution of the love story. The quest is for the hero (Brad) to win the heroine's (Jan's) heart. The obstacle is the heroine (Jan) resisting the hero's (Brad's) love. The resolution is the hero (Brad) overcomes the heroine's (Jan's) resistance and wins her heart. However, for the pursuit plot to work, there must be a prick foil or a romantic rival. Jonathan is the prick foil and his ideological function is to help out the hero (Brad) by ensuring the success of the pursuit plot. In fact, Jan's resistance to Jonathan is not only a portent that Brad will be the hero, but she and the hero must reject the romantic prick (obstacle) and recognize that they are meant for each other, perfect mates (resolution). Moreover, in between the beginning and end of the film, the sequence of events proceed in a linear storytelling manner much like the male sex act in its insistent forward motion as noted by film theorist Laura Mulvey (qtd. in Cohen) while presenting the female and male gazes. When

the resolution or goal is reached, boy gets girl and girl gets boy, the couple gets married before sex, which supports traditional gender roles, family, and a patriarchal ideology.

The effect of the pursuit plot with a male point of view on the portrayal of woman is that the woman's gaze, even if assertive toward the domineering male, is suppressed when the hero overcomes the heroine's resistance and wins her heart. Thus, the conventional Hollywood romantic comedy quashes a woman's resistance while telling a love story that perpetuates a patriarchal ideology. Moreover, the hierarchy of knowledge is greater for the male and the audience than it is for the female, who does not know about the males' manipulation and thoughts. Additionally, women as spectacle are attractive rewards for the males' efforts at seduction, so women can't move the plot forward, only men can. Thus, the director, Michael Gordon, and the screenwriters, Stanley Shapiro and Maurice Richlin, who romanticize females and exploit them for the males' benefit, present the attitude of males toward women in the 1959 culture.

Even though Nora Ephron indicates the plot is absent in *When Harry Met Sally*, film scholar Mark Rubinfeld contends there is a pursuit plot in the film, and like *Pillow Talk* it is delivered from the male's point of view in the narrative structure. In contrast to *Pillow Talk*, the plot does not proceed in a linear storytelling manner. It is a story about a man (Harry) who does not use force to control and/or possess a woman (Sally). Instead, he uses subtle manipulation along with pity and guilt. The quest is for Harry to win Sally's heart. The obstacles are being single versus being married; sexuality and women's orgasms; love, sexuality, and friendship. However, the pursuit plot is combined with the coldhearted redemption plot while emphasizing female emotions. Moreover, the hero (Harry) of the coldhearted redemption plot is bitter and incapable of love. He (Harry) is

scared of commitment and struggles to say, “I love you.” What he (Harry) needs is a redemptive heroine (Sally) or the hero’s lifeline (Rubinfeld 14; 23; 27; 31). But the plot is secondary to spectacle, which is probably why Ephron says there is no plot. Spectacle is more important than plot because it is where the female gaze is stronger than the male gaze. In the setting we witness dialogue as an adjunct to the characters’ style (clothes, accessories, and home furnishings), serving as permission for women to be themselves or self-expressive (Cohen 85-87). And that self-expression aids females achieving self-fulfillment with work, friendships, and marriage. In fact, Sally assertive persona appeals to males and females in the audience. Both can learn valuable relationship lessons such as all women fake orgasms, men who break your heart must demonstrate their love, not just say, “I love you.” And friends can be lovers and lovers can be friends, but lovers who are friends have the best possible world when married. In spite of Sally’s powerful gift of persuasion, and advantages offered educated women in 1989 society regarding careers and lifestyle, her goal is marriage and a family, which supports traditional gender roles, family values, and a patriarchal ideology.

Harry and Sally’s love story is about boy gets girl, boy loses girl, and boy gets girl back, so they do not simply fall in love and live happily ever after. Paramount to the happy ending are the friends who listen, advise, empathize, sympathize, and support Harry and Sally in their up and down journey as they mature over ten years to ultimately embrace marriage. We are along for the ride, as the tone and mood of the film evokes our sympathetic emotions in reaction to the witty dialogue, and memorable one-liners and quotes, which are forever etched in our minds, making this film worthy of multiple viewings.

Pillow Talk and *When Harry Met Sally* are two successful iconic romantic comedies. While *Pillow Talk* permanently changed the star persona of Doris Day and Rock Hudson and initiated a series of sex comedies, which were considered racy at the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s. The weakened state of the Production Code Administration (PCA) still would not permit sexual nudity and sexual perversion, but would permit discussion and narration of sexual topics, but there was no sex enacted in a sex comedy (McDonald 42-43; 51). Consequently, Hollywood delivered conventional romantic comedies that supported traditional gender roles and family values and a patriarchal ideology despite the changing 1959 society. Obviously, Hollywood was not motivated to keep up with the times as evidenced by the Alfred Kinsey 1953 report on *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female,* the publication of *Playboy* in 1953, and the sex comedy film *The Moon is Blue,* which used the word "virgin." Understandably, the changing audiences felt the sex comedy was out of touch with the times. Women no longer feared unwanted pregnancy with the availability of the pill, resulting in a new moral climate that didn't chastise "nice" girls engaging in premarital sex (McDonald 41-43).

Theme

Thirty years after *Pillow Talk*, Nora Ephron wrote the screenplay for *When Harry Met Sally* and along with Rob Reiner's direction it became another iconic romantic comedy. Unlike the 1959 society, the 1989 society had an AIDS crisis, resulting in the ascent of the religious right and its emphasis on sexual caution, monogamy, and abstinence. Once again audiences were interested in narrative structures that promoted a return to traditional gender roles and family values and a patriarchal ideology, giving rise

to films where boy meets, loses, regains girl, and the emphasis in the heterosexual couple by the end of their story forming a lasting relationship. However, quite different from the sex comedy *Pillow Talk* was delivery of the same overriding theme—the females seek self-fulfillment through marriage. *When Harry Met Sally* is a neo-traditional romantic comedy. The themes supporting the overriding theme are more contemporary to lure male and female audiences. On the other hand, the themes supporting the same overriding theme in *Pillow Talk* are unrealistically entertaining. They lack the sophistication and contemporary appeal that is depicted in *When Harry Met Sally*. Hierarchy of knowledge, masquerade, and the reversal of the natural order, themes in *Pillow Talk*, do not require the viewer to reflect on relationship issues like friendship, sexual pleasure, love, marriage, gender differences, commitment, which audiences are tempted to consider as part of the *When Harry Met Sally* movie experience. Since Hollywood is in the business to make money, then audience expectations, societal desires, and creative and thought provoking screenplays worthy of multiple viewings across time periods will be some guarantee for success in the box office along with incorporating changing technology and social and digital advertising.

Thus, in the films *Pillow Talk* and *When Harry Met Sally*, the mood and tone as depicted through dialogue and music reinforces the stereotypical setting, themes, point of view and characters of each time period.

WORKS CITED

Abbot, Stacey and Deborah Jermyn, eds. *Falling in Love Again: Romantic Comedy in Contemporary Cinema.* New York: I. B. Tauris, 2009. Print.

"AFI's 10 Top 10." American Film Institute. January 15, 2016. Retrieved 2016-01 -15. Web.

Anderson, JoAnn. "No Affairs Worth Remembering." *Wall Street Journal,* 1 August 2008. Academic Search Premier. Web. 4 July 2012.

Belton, John. *American Cinema/American Culture*. McGraw-Hill, Inc.: New York, 1994. Print.

Cohen, Paula Marantz. "What Have Clothes Got to Do with It? Romantic Comedy And the Female Gaze." *The Southwest Review.* 2010. Print.

Curtiz, Michael. Online biography. *New York Times. Web. 28 July 2012.*

Denby, David. "A Fine Romance." *New Yorker* 23 July 2007: 58-65. Academic Search Premier. Web. 4 July 2012.

"Dorothy Arzner Interview." Interview with Karyn Kay and Gerald Peary. *Cinema* (U.S.) 34: (1974). Web. 26 July 2012.

"Film and the Women's Movement." *American Decades.* 2001. *Encyclopedia.com.* Web. 18 May 2012.

Giannetti, Louis. *Understanding Films.* 4th ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1987. Print.

Grindon, Leger. *The Secret Life of Romantic Comedy/Romantic Comedy: Boy Meets Girl Meets Genre. Film Quarterly* 63,4 (Summer 2010): 82-83. ProQuest Research Library. Web. 17 July 2012.

Grindon, Leger. *The Hollywood Romantic Comedy: Conventions, History, Controversies*. United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 2011. Print.

Lupino, Ida and Mary Ann Anderson. *Ida Lupino: Beyond the Camera.* Bear Manor Media, 2011. Print.

McDonald, Tamar Jeffers. *Romantic Comedy: Boy Meets Girl Meets Genre.* London: Wallflower, 2007. Print.

Morton, Danelle. *People Profines Meg Ryan: A Biography.* New York: Time Inc., 2000. Print.

Muir, Anne Ross. "The Status of Women Working in Film and Television." *The Female Gaze.* Eds. Lorraine Gamman and Margaret Marshment. Seattle, WA: The Real Comet Press, 1989. 143-146; 150-152; 211-212. Print.

Pillow Talk. Dir. Michael Gordon. Perf. Doris Day, Rock Hudson, and Tony Randall. Arwin Productions, Universal International Pictures (UI), 1959. 2004 DVD.

Powers, Stephen P. and David J. Rothman and Stanley Rothman. "Transformation of Gender Roles in Hollywood Movies: 1946-1990. *Political Communications* 10 (1993): 259-283. *Communication & Mass Media Complete.* .Web. 18 July 2012.

Radner, Hilary. *Neo-Feminist Cinema: Girly Films, Chick Films and Consumer Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2011. Print.

Rubinfeld, Mark D. *Bound to Bond: Gender, Genre, and the Hollywood Romantic Comedy.* Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2001. Print.

Smith, Stephen M., William D. McIntosh, and Doris G. Bazzini. "Are the Beautiful

Good in Hollywood? An Investigation of the Beauty-and- Goodness Stereotype On Film." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 21.1 (1999): 69 -80. Web. 17 July 2012.

Tan, Cherl Lu-Lien. "When Harry Met Sally: For some, it's become a film icon." *The Baltimore Sun.* 16 Feb. 2001. Web.

The Female Gaze. Eds. Lorraine Gamman and Margaret Marshment. Seattle, WA: The Real Comet Press, 1989. Print.

Thielfoldt, Diane and Devon Scheef. "Generation X and The Millennials: What You Need to know About Mentoring the New Generations." *The Learning Café And American Demographics Enterprising Museum.* August 2004. Web. 18 July 2012.

Walsh, Andrea. *Women's Film And Female Experience: 1940-1950.* New York: Praeger, 1984. Print.

Wasko, Janet. "Hollywood and Television in the 1950s: The Roots of Diversification."

History of the American Cinema 7: *The Fifties-Transforming the Screen 1950-1959.* Peter Lev. ed. New York: Thomas-Gale, 2003. Print.

When Harry Met Sally. Box Office Mojo. January 15, 2016. Retrieved 2016-1-15. Web.

When Harry Met Sally. Dir. Rob Reiner. Perf. Billy Crystal, Meg Ryan, and Carrie Fisher. Castle Rock Entertainment, Nelson Entertainment, 1989. 2001. DVD.

"Will Hays: America's Morality Czar." *Encyclopedia of World Biography Supplement* 21. *Gale Group,* 2001. Web. 28 July 2012.

VITA

Full name: Helena Ann Swanicke

Place and date of birth: Somerville, New Jersey August 9, 1953

Parents Name: Alex and Agnes Gwiazdowski

Educational Institutions:

School	Place	Degree	Date
Secondary:	Alma Preparatory, Zarephath, NJ	High School Diploma	June 1971
Collegiate:	Rutgers College, New Brunswick, NJ	B.S. Degree	May 1976
Graduate:	Concordia University, River Forest, IL	M.A. Degree	May 1987
	Drew University, Madison, NJ	M.Litt. Degree	May 2003
	Drew University, Madison, NJ	D.Litt. Degree	May 2016