

BETWEEN SILENCE AND ABJECTION: THE FILM MEDIUM AND THE ISRAELI WAR WIDOW

REGINE MIHAL FRIEDMAN

University of Tel Aviv

The Israeli cinema has been characterised these last few years by a dual phenomenon which it would seem difficult not to link with traumatic events such as the war in Lebanon and the *Intifada*. On the one hand, a series of films have finally dared to tackle an obsessive problem, one which, as will be shown, had previously been suggested metaphorically. *Don't give a damn* (S. Himberman, 1987), *Shell Shock* (Y. Sharon, 1988), *Bell Room* (A. Gutman, 1988), and *Burning Memories* (Y. Somer, 1989) show young soldiers affected in their physical integrity, wounded in their virility. On the other hand, the triumphal revival of sketches and comedies produced over twenty years ago by Uri Zohar¹ has demonstrated the nostalgia that the younger generations sustain towards a paradise lost of innocence and lack of responsibility.

But, even if they appear today as revealing a blissful unconsciousness, such «buddy films» (for such is the expression established by Molly Haskell²), such «men stories» have nevertheless set up the deep narrative structure underpinning most films produced in Israel since. Movies featuring war, military training, prisoners; political thrillers, road and wandering films, these genres have traditionally assigned to the female figure a second place, one which in the Israeli cinema is even sometimes entirely suppressed (*Avanti popolo*, R. Bukai, 1986; *Beyond the walls*, U. Barbash, 1984).

Through the diversity of subjects and themes a common pattern has therefore set in, always rooted in the here and now of Israeli reality. The male protagonist emerges from a virile group which seems to make up his natural environment: the classroom, the team, the patrol, the elite corps, the cell, even the gang. He draws near the «Absolutely Other One»³, woman, and tries the experiment of living as a couple, a trial from which he most often emerges unsatisfied, frustrated, bruised. He then comes back to the fellowship of his peers, to fusion with sameness. Because of his dangerous activities, the hero's quest most often ends in death.

Compared with this condemned man with a limited suspended sentence, widowhood becomes the commonest social status, whether official or not⁴, that the Israeli cinema bestows on women. We have selected four films in which the war widow has pride of place. More than twenty years, a time lapse of one generation, separate these productions. This gives the Israeli cinema time to switch from clumsy homily (*The Hero's Wife*, 1963) to productions that look to the New Wave for inspiration (*Siege*, 1968), and finally to films oscillating between conformity to proven formulae and the adoption of a more personal style (*Repeat Dive*, 1982; *Atalia*, 1984).

THE ISRAELI WOMAN: FROM HISTORY TO MYTH

These films illustrate the process whereby the Israeli woman has gradually been excluded from history which she nevertheless had actively contributed to making⁵ only to be consigned to myth, which henceforth allows the most pernicious projections. Thus, in spite of the linguistic specificity borne by the name, the title of the last of our texts, *Atalia* connotes, within the literary and biblical tradition, the dark archaic and phallic mother, the destructive «femme fatale»⁶. On the other hand, the title of the first of these films, *The Hero's Wife* (Peter Frye, 1963) could fit all others. Etymologically speaking, widowhood, in most European languages, is associated with a void, a lack. As for the Hebrew root, it defines it as abandonment, anonymity, loss of identity⁷. Rachel, the widow of a hero of the War of Independence (1968) is therefore defined in terms of the prestige enjoyed by her spouse, but the same applies to Tamar in *Siege* (Gilberto Tofeno, 1968), produced after the Six-Day War; to Mira, who has lived within the shadow of the commando of *Repeat Dive* (Shimon Doran, 1982); last, to *Atalia* (Akiva Tevet, 1984) whose husband fell in the Sinai in 1956 and whose teenage daughter weeps, at the end of the movie, over her boyfriend who died during the first days of the Yom-Kippur War. «We are all choking; we live physically and morally in a state of siege», one of the characters cries out in Tofano's film who thus expresses the tension affecting human relations in a nation perpetually at war. But *Siege* reveals and denounces above all the pressure exerted on young women by society, which demands of them a conduct conforming to its norms. «They want me to be a perpetual remembrance flame,» complains one of the young widows. And yet these films set their heroines in an environment which, while socially constraining them, is nonetheless a privileged one, whether it be the kibbutz (*The Hero's Wife*; *Atalia*) or the army (*Siege*; *Repeat Dive*). Such a trick of scenario thus eliminates the painful ordeal affecting war widows: the unavoidable deterioration of their status which sociological research throws into relief at the outset⁸. Such cinematic widows will therefore be spared burdensome and humiliating formalities imposed by meandering bureaucracy. On the other hand, emphasis will be laid on the uncomfortable situation of the «unattached»⁹ woman in a community that has traditionally favoured the married status. This has led Lesley Hazleton to evoke «the extreme coupledness of Israeli society»¹⁰ and Lea Shamgar-Handelman to state that, "there is no place for a widow in Israeli society, so highly familistic."¹¹ *Repeat Dive* would then be the ambiguous metaphor fitting each of our stories, since they all revolve around the new relationship entered into by the young widow.

FEMININE TERRITORY

According to some researchers¹², the Jewish and Israeli experience is haunted by the problem of space (Exile, Dispersion, Ingathering of the Dispersed); therefore

each of our films conveys a spatial vision in which, in the final analysis, female and male territories will wind up totally separated. This is not yet the case with *The Hero's Wife*, whose first scene shows an ominous border post sign; bombardment originating in the mountains of Syria constitutes its climax while the epilogue shows treetops swaying under the sky; as background, one hears the musical theme of the movie *This is My Home, Facing the Golan*.

Side by side with this obsessive fear due to threatened and attacked space, in a pre-1967 border kibbutz, *Siege* features pictures of the frontline and the home front: Outposts where the War of Attrition is already raging, and Tel Aviv, intoxicated by the victory of the Six-Day War, opening up to the consumer society and Western temptation. The well-mastered cinematic writing of the film will show the permeability of these various universes. In alternating fashion it features the documentary approach, which photographs, in a real-life situation, a street suddenly stopping dead upon hearing alarming news; the quick montage piling up signs of the big city (posters, advertising, neon signs) as well as testimony of pain and mourning; the very elaborate compositions narrowly centering the widow and her son in their home, and also subjective views in which Tamar mulls over her memories, imagining the moment that was deadly for her husband. Even television pictures - a recent appearance in 1968 - are also integrated into a then-innovative brand of aesthetics. And yet the work inaugurates the dichotomy of a virile space of action and danger, and a feminine, domestic and protected space. This was to be taken up again, albeit expressed differently, in the last two films.

The prologue of *Repeat Dive* opens with a surf-pounded beach at sunset. Male voices are heard rising up in a strange and inarticulate litany¹³. Silhouettes of young men are outlined against the horizon, putting on their frogman suit and boarding a rowboat. This is the start of a military operation whereby sea and sky soon flare up, extolling, in the best tradition of war films, the beauty of the confrontation and bravery of the fighters. In contrast, Mira, shut in at home, tirelessly listens to the cassette - the testament of Yohi, her husband, who in a *sui generis* interpretation of the levirate¹⁴ entrusted her, should misfortune befall him, to his best friend Yoav.

The movie *Atalia* first shows young Mati training in anticipation of his being drafted and later, together with other young recruits, running along dunes overlooking the sea. Discharged for medical reasons and sent back to the kibbutz, Mati becomes the lover of another reject: Atalia, old enough to be his mother. He appears again, working in the fields against the background of the sky, while a parallel montage reveals Atalia shut in at home¹⁵. The open space of male activity thus stands in contrast with female territory: The room to which Atalia withdraws, the barn where she entertains her lovers, the laundry room where she works at night.

THE OTHER ONE'S GAZE

According to Atalia herself, this deliberately chosen isolation and withdrawal allow her to avoid the inquisitorial, disapproving gaze. Each film features innumerable

exchanges of glances sustained by dialogue, voice-off or voice-over remarks, inner monologues. «Through the Other one's gaze, I saw myself», writes J.-P. Sartre, «as if frozen amidst the world, as if in danger, as if beyond remedy ... In short, I grasped myself as an object, but not for myself»¹⁶. Now if «The Other one reveals himself to me as the subject for whom I am an object»¹⁷, it is through the body that such a revelation is effected: «I exist for myself as for others as a body»¹⁸.

Rachel, who has totally internalised the norms of the extended, tribal family in which she moves, responds to such an invasion of the «unattached» female body through gazing by submission, and she takes on a lay saint «persona», devoted and altruistic. The impetuous irruption of an outsider will give back to Rachel an awareness of her desire and of her body. But in order to transform the sensual emotion into an erotic explosion it will be necessary, according to the heroic-national kind of code¹⁹ permeating this movie, that the suitor perform an act of bravery: He will save the kibbutz -and Rachel, too - during the Syrian attack.

This model, wherein male initiative introduces change and suggests to the young widow a new type of relationship, is reproduced in each of the widowhood stories. In *Siege* the large «family of fighters», i.e. the former comrades-at-arms of her husband, take charge of Tamar. But she also feels trapped by their solicitude, their vigilant control of her comings and goings. Encounters with married couples reveal to her both her total loneliness and the desire resulting from her newfound availability²⁰.

Within the somewhat summary symbolic system of the *The Hero's Wife*, a long stance in front of her mirror suggested, in Rachel, the recovery of her feminine narcissism; while Tamar contemplates herself in it only to hide her own gaze behind dark glasses. Later, under the alienating gaze of others, she adopts the female strategy of the «vacant look» theorised by Th. Elsaesser²¹ and that J. Brückner calls the «flight of the gaze into ideal vagueness»²². She also tries the masquerade, which, «in flaunting femininity, holds it at a distance»²³ where «the woman uses her own body as a disguise»²⁴.

Such a dual strategy is also adopted by Atalia, who adds to it the provocative exhibitionism of her finery, which is out of place in the kibbutz, and which «is constituted by a hyperbolisation of the accoutrements of femininity»²⁵. We must however be reminded that it is upon seeing her cry while she thinks she is alone that Mati is moved for the first time.

Mira, in *Repeat Dive*, represents an exceptional case. The movie also makes of her an object of the insistent stare of her husband's comrades, but, in addition, bestows upon her the lucidity and boldness to shoot back a look no less cynical than the one reifying her. Atalia allowed herself to engage in verbal subversion. Coming from a marginalized personality, her anti-establishment discourse could only be attributed to her eccentricity, and thereby neutralised. On the other hand Mira dares to disavow the virile other one in his body. Turning a typical situation around during her first intimate encounter with Yoav, her husband's friend, she kills his desire and while fully dressed

and contemplating the naked body of her naked partner she comments: «You are tanned and healthy like police horses, it is impossible to tell the two of you apart». Baffled, her companion is then only able to paraphrase the all too famous Freudian question «But what is it you want?».

Now woman cannot possibly be the acting subject of looking and get away with it²⁶, and Mira will be punished for her impudence through loneliness and dereliction. Yoav will prefer easier and less demanding feminine contacts, thus retracing the steps of her defunct husband. As for Tamar, she is merely criticised. Her neighbours, her husband's friend reported to her, had seen her clad in a miniskirt and wearing a wig. Atalia's fate, within the egalitarian Kibbutz society, will cause her to be not only insulted but also battered by her various lovers.

In his analysis of the existence of the Other one, Sartre writes: «In confronting the Other one's look, I defend myself by confronting the Other one and the possibility remains for me to transform the Other one into an object»²⁷. Further on, Sartre will show that in sadism ``emphasis is placed... on instrumental appropriation of the Other incarnate»²⁸.

FROM VOYEURISM TO SADISM: «THE ENTIRE BODY IS PSYCHIC»

It is essentially the sadistic dimension of voyeurism that is brought out by an important current of cinema theory which is concerned above all by the problem of mirror identification. Uniting the Freudian model of the scopophilic drive and the Lacanian concept of suture²⁹, Ch. Metz³⁰, but especially Laura Mulvey in a now classic article, have shown «the way the unconscious of patriarchal society has structured film form»³¹. Now while Mulvey's text finds itself today, if not disputed, at least completed by other analyses taking into account the feminine spectatorial position³², her thesis remains central for the analysis of the films we are concerned with. We have shown how voyeurism and sadism were closely interwoven therein. The investigatory male gaze constituted the only position of spectatorial pleasure. These films emphasise the polarisation of sex differences where woman represents «lack». According to Mulvey, it is in order to escape the anguish connoted by such lack that the male unconscious sometimes magnifies woman, turns her into a fetish negating castration, and at other times subjects her to incessant examination in order to pierce her mystery. This is the alternative chosen by our films. «Pleasure lies in ascertaining guilt (immediately associated with castration), asserting control and subjecting the guilty person through punishment or forgiveness»³³. Now it would seem that our films also stigmatise female guilt according to criteria less unconscious if not wholly avowed.

A comparison with texts from another society at war appeared revealing to us, in this case the literature inspired by the Second World War to fighting writers. In an essay entitled "This is my rifle, this is my gun: World War II and the Blitz on Women,"

S. Gubar, who has analysed such texts, writes: «Ive images of women in these works. They are viewed almost entirely as ladies-in-waiting, solacing outsiders or resented beneficiaries of suffering. Even the women who represent the values that men are struggling to retain amidst barbaric, death-dealing circumstances are often identified as the cause of the fighting»³⁴.

And Janice Welsh, in an article about films in a similar vein, adds the following: «An immense amount of male hatred was directed toward women...Mothers are no longer seen as protectors, having given their sons over to the state. Wives are presented as predators who are eager to enjoy not only the freedom their husband's absence allows, but also the financial rewards his war-death will generate»³⁵.

If a horrible war, but one which after all was limited in time, was able to provoke such extreme anti-female reactions, one can readily imagine that the endless conflict between Israel and her neighbours has not remained without consequences and that the latter are detectable in her cinema.

FETISH AND BODY

Confined to domestic space, robbed of her gaze, need one specify that woman also remains voiceless? Ideological debating, stands taken are male features, even if originally (as in *Siege* or *Repeat Dive*) woman was the pretext of the exchange of ideas. Now the specificity of the Israeli cinema may be seen in the fact that it is the only one, in the final analysis, to also deprive woman of her body. It thus vitiates the above-cited analysis of L. Mulvey in which she contrasts male activity, which opens the screen towards the depth and movement of history, with homage paid to feminine beauty, which interrupts the flux of diegesis and imposes the bidimensionality of an icon.

Still, as always, here it is the male body which is on display, in a state of nudity or near-nudity justified by both the narrative structure and the Mediterranean climate. Shown down to its least discreet manifestations, the male body also remains strangely present through what constitutes the limit, the frontier, which J. Kristeva has called the «object»: the rejected part, the «fallen» of the body³⁶.

It is a rare Israeli film indeed, no matter what genre it belongs to, no matter who its director, that is not at one point or another stained with the «object», the excremental: blood, sweat, spittle, vomit... Now this obsessive relationship to the excremental must, to our way of thinking, be bound up with the cyclical configuration evoked above: the regressive return to the gang which also implies rejection of adult sexuality and of woman. It is therefore necessary to come back to the Freudian description which yields «the notion of a pregenital organisation in which sadistic and erotic-anal drives predominate»³⁷. This essential aspect of anility, which according to Freud would consist in «a tendency to control and possess»³⁸ is seen to be expressed by the aggressivity shown throughout our set of films towards woman. Refusal of genital, adult sexuality could also

be manifest in the innumerable scenes of voyeurism where the desire to inspect, if not to punish, goes together with a very infantile «will to know».

Antifeminine violence might emanate from the extreme polarisation of genres which has in the meantime occurred within Israeli society in which the integrity of the male body is the only kind threatened in the unceasing wars opposing Israel and her neighbours. The gradual resignation of woman excluding herself from roles formerly assumed by her might also account for male bitterness.

«TO EACH EGO ITS OBJECT, TO EACH SUPEREGO ITS ABJECT»³⁹.

Fetishization of the male body assumes its full meaning since we are dealing with an «exposed» body, a body in distress, on the verge of being bruised, burned, emasculated. The abject would, according to Kristeva, indicate a no man's land between living and dead, between organic and inorganic: «If dung signifies the other side of the border, the place where I am not and which permits me to be, the corpse, the most sickening of wastes, is a border that has encroached upon everything. It is no longer I who expel, «I» is expelled...»⁴⁰ Playing with the abject, manipulation of the excremental would then be a way of gaining the irreparable, to tame death.

Pagan «defilement», biblical «abomination», Christian «sin»: Kristeva examines the way in which rituals characteristic of patriarchal religions have attempted to circumscribe the abject. «The abject confronts us, on the one hand, with those fragile states where man strays on the territories of *animal*». Thus by way of abjection, primitive societies have marked out a precise area of their culture in order to remove it from the threatening world of animals or animalism, which were imagined as representatives of sex and murder. The abject confronts us, on the other hand, and this time within our personal archeology, with our earliest attempts to release the hold of *maternal* entity even before existing outside of her, thanks to the autonomy of language»⁴¹.

Exploring the three great categories of biblical abomination: 1) food taboos; 2) corporeal alteration and its climax, death; 3) the feminine body and incest, Kristeva shows that their key figure is maternal entreaty, as suggested by the prohibition to consume blood. «Blood, as a vital element, also refers to women, fertility and the assurance of fecundation. It thus becomes a fascinating semantic crossroads, the propitious place for abjection where *death* and *femininity*, murder and *procreation*, *cessation of life* and *vitality* all come together»⁴².

Nevertheless, while Kristeva has shunned all calls «to anal eroticism or the fear of castration,» «because», she says, «one cannot help *hearing* the reticence of anthropologists when confronted with that explanation» she still suggests that these two types of defilement, the one threatening identity from the outside (decay, infection, disease, corpse, etc.), the other from the inside (menstrual blood) «stem from the maternal and/or the feminine of which the maternal is the real support»⁴³.

Before following Kristeva to the extent of her disturbing conclusions, let us note that in an entirely different view, Gilles Deleuze also sees in the rejection of the mother one of the conditions favouring the expression of sadism. «The sadist», Deleuze writes, «has such a strong superego that he winds up identifying with it: He is his own superego and no longer finds any ego except on the outside. What usually moralises the superego is the inwardness and the complementarity of an ego upon which it exercises its rigour. It is also the maternal component, the guardian of such complementarity. But when the superego is unleashed, when it expels the ego together with the maternal image, then its basic immorality shows through what is called sadism. Sadism makes no other victims besides the mother and the ego...»⁴⁴.

At the end of her chapter on the semiotics of biblical abomination, J. Kristeva stresses the complementarity of taboos, foodwise and otherwise, as well as of sacrifices. Since the Book of Leviticus has introduced a legislation of prohibitions regarding food, the law of purity and holiness which follows therefore replaces the sacrifice. The law is «what curtains sacrifice, restrains the desire to kill»...the very idea of homicide as an offence to God is present throughout the biblical text⁴⁵. Kristeva then draws the surprising consequence: «Mother and death, both abominated, abjected, slyly built a victimising and persecuting machine at the cost of which I become subject of the symbolic as well as Other of the Object»⁴⁶.

We shall also remember that Kristeva sees in the artistic experience one of the modalities of purification of the abject. This displacement, which she calls attention to, is especially clear in the different forms that these tales take on in Israel, where the protagonists ->I am from the very beginning subject to persecution as well as to revenge<- collapse and finally expiate in death.

Some alternatives have been propounded in recent films. *One of Us* (U. Barbash, 1989), just as *The Valley Train* (Y. Paz, 1989), again pick up the refrain wherein woman becomes -literally in the case of *One of Us*- the target of male aggressiveness and resentment. On the other hand the series of films dealing with the war wounded and maimed inverts these conditions and lodges the woman in the role of the archaic Great Mother⁴⁷, one to whom the male, made impotent and infantilized, can only masochistically submit⁴⁸. Moreover, in two relatively recent films it is feminine phantasizing -as imagined by the moviemakers- which tells a great deal about the split between the two worlds.

In *The Last Winter* (R. Shelah, 1984) two women whose husbands are listed as missing after the Yom-Kippur war both believe they have recognised them in a newsreel featuring prisoners of war. They become friends, one of them expressing her feelings of guilt, the other imagining a more satisfactory way of life, alone with her son... In *Photo-roman* (T. Ron, 1988) a high school senior plans the novels she expects to write later. Thus she imagines the death of her boyfriend serving in the Army, analyses her reactions.

Still we are allowed to hope, on the basis of recent feminine initiatives, that some texts might be read again, this time in a different way. Henceforth Sarah will be the one attempting to stop Isaac's ascent to sacrifice, as well as Ishmael's.

NOTES AND REFERENCES:

- (1) A movie and television producer and excellent comedian, Uri Zohar directed ten films from 1965 onwards until he went into a religious retreat in 1977. «His eclecticism and also his versatility made him tackle all registers but caused people to doubt his status as an author». He still remains one of the most creative and most representative personalities of the «State generation».
- (2) Molly HASKELL: *From Reverence to Rape: The Treatment of the Women in the Movies*. New York: Penguin Books Inc., 1977, p. 323.
- (3) «I believe that the absolutely contrary... is *the feminine*... otherness is effected in the feminine...» Emmanuel LEVINAS, *Le Temps et l'Autre*. Paris: Quadrige/P.U.F, 1983.
- (4) While several works feature war widows whose role remains secondary, there are more films where young girls lose their boyfriends in wars.
- (5) Some films made at that time by foreign directors, feature young girls fighting side by side with young soldiers in *A Sword in the Desert* (George Sherman, 1949) and *Hill 24 Does Not Answer* (Thorold Dickinson, 1954).
- (6) We wish to thank Yael Shuv for having made available to us the text of his radio talk of March 11th, 1990: «Atalia: The short story of the film.»
- (7) Lesley HAZLETON, *Israeli Women: The Reality Behind the Myths*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1977, p. 181.
- (8) Lea SHAMGAR-HANDELMAN, *Israeli War Widows: Beyond the Glory of Heroism*. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey, 1986.
- (9) We borrow this term from the article by Emile POPPE: «Reflexions sur le rôle thématique: 'La Veuve', in *All That Heaven Allows*, by D. SIRK,» *Iris*, No. 8 (second semester 1988): 83-94. The author puts forward his own version of Greimas' semiotic square in order to account for this semantic category. To our way of thinking the model is not exhaustive since it includes, under the term «untied» both widows/widowers and divorcés/divorcées.
- (10) L. HAZLETON, *Op. cit.*, p. 180.
- (11) *Ibid.*, p. 182.
- (12) Uri EISENZWEIG, *Territoires occupés de l'Imaginaire Juif: Essai sur l'Espace Sioniste*. Paris: Christian Bourgois, 1980, p. 12.
- (13) See, in this volume, the article by Tirza KUGLER «A captive in the world of Men and War».
- (14) Levirate: According to legislation established by the Bible (Deut. 25.5), if a man should die childless his brother must marry his widow. See Janine GDALIA and Annie GOLDMANN: *Le Judaïsme au féminin*, Paris: Balland, 1989, pp. 162-163. In the film, the brotherhood of the members of the commando, and especially that of the two teammates, Yohi and Yoav, is constantly stressed.
- (15) See, in this volume, the article by Nurit GEERTZ, «Atalia».
- (16) Jean-Paul SARTRE, *L'Être et le Néant: essai d'ontologie phénoménologique*. Paris: N.R.F., 1957, p. 320.

(17) *Ibid.*, p. 419.

(18) *Ibid.*

(19) Ella SHOHAT, *Israeli Cinema: East and West and the Politics of Representation*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1989, Chap. II «The Heroic-National Genre», pp. 57-114.

(20) The topic of the film was suggested by Gila Almagor, the main actor of the film, who had conversations with Six-Day War widows. The situation involved has been related many times, as in the work of L. HAZLETON, *Op. cit.*, p. 181: '«All the husbands of my friends started appearing at the door... alone».

(21) Thomas ELSAESSER: '«Pabst's Pandora Box» in Eric RENTSCHLER (Ed.) *German Film and Literature. Adaptations and Transformations*. New York: Methuen, 1986, pp. 40-59.

(22) Jutta BRUCKER: «Cinéma, Regard, Violence», *Les Cahiers du Grif*, Octobre 1982, p. 87.

(23) Mary-Ann DOANE: «Film and the Masquerade: Theorizing the Female Spectator», *Screen*, No. 23, 3-4, September-October 1982, pp. 74-87.

(24) Michèle Montrelay, quoted by M.A. DOANE, p. 82.

(25) M.A. DOANE, *Op. cit.*, p. 81.

(26) *Ibid.*, p. 84.

(27) J.-P. SARTRE, *Op. cit.*, p. 450.

(28) *Ibid.*, p. 469.

(29) Gertrud KOCH: «Exchanging the gaze: Revisioning Feminist Film Theory», *New German Critique*, No. 34, Winter 1985, pp. 139-153.

(30) Christian METZ, *Psychoanalysis and Cinema: The Imaginary Signifier*. London: Mac Millan Press, 1982.

(31) Laura MULVEY: «Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema», *Screen*, 16.3, Autumn 1975, pp. 6-18.

(32) Carol J. CLOVER: «Her Body, Himself: Gender in the Slasher Film.» *Representations*, No. 20, Fall 1987, pp. 187-228. Linda WILLIAMS: «Power, Pleasure and Perversion: Sadomasochistic Film Pornography», *Representations*, No. 27, Summer 1989, pp. 36-64.

(33) L. Mulvey, *Op. cit.*

(34) Susan Gubar: «This is my rifle, this is my gun: World War II and the Blitz on Women» in M.R. HIGONNET, Jane JENSON, Sonya MICHELI, M.C. WEITZ (Eds.) *Behind the lines: Gender and the Two World Wars*. Yale University Press, 1987, pp. 227-259.

(35) Janice WELSH: «Power and Patriarchy in «Notorious» (A. Hitchcock, 1946). Unpublished article.

(36) Julia KRISTEVA, *Powers of Horror: An essay on Abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

(37) According to Jean LAPLANCHE and J.P. PONTALIS, *Vocabulaire de la psychanalyse*. Paris: P.U.F., 1967.

(38) Erich FROMM, *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*. New York Holt: Rinehart & Winston, 1972.

(39) J. KRISTEVA, *Op. cit.*, pp. 3-4.

(40) *Ibid.*, p. 13.

(41) *Ibid.*, p. 96.

(42) *Ibid.*, p. 42.

(43) Gilles DELEUZE, *Présentation de Sacher-Masoch: le Froid et le Cruel*. Paris: Union générale d'Éditions, 1967, p. 123.

(44) J. KRISTEVA, *Op. cit.*, p. 71.

(45) *Ibid.*, p. 112.

(46) *Ibid.*

(47) Yosefa LOSHILZKY: «The Bride of the Dead: Phallocentrism and War in Kaniuk and Gutman's *Himo, King of Jerusalem*».

(48) Barbara CREED: «Horror and the Monstrous Feminine: An Imaginary Abjection», *Screen*, January-February 1986.