

A RESTRICTED LOOK AT PSYCHO: ON GAZE AND VOICE OVER

E. Gülay ER PASİN*

Abstract

Psycho (Alfred Hitchcock, 1960) is of prime importance for the horror genre since Hitchcock places horror in settings of everyday life. It is also important for its narrative structure along with the editing of the shower scene, God's eye view shots of staircase scenes that limit the view of the audience, the use of voice over for making meaning, altering the identification of the viewer, the psychological aspect and score. The movie has had an unignorable effect on cinema with its sequels, prequel, a documentary about the movie, an avant-garde movie which is a replica, an appropriation of Psycho presented as an art installation, a semibiographic movie on the process of producing the movie, a murder scene that became a cliché as well as borrowings or references in other movies and countless books, reviews and articles about it.

Psycho is a favorite subject of the studies which primarily analyze its narrative, film score, and psycho-analysis. This study, choosing a restricted angle, aims to analyze the gaze and voice over with regard to the relationship between characters and places. With this aim the embodied metaphors which are closely linked with 'the eye' in the movie are also researched. The look, the gaze and the metaphors of the eye contribute greatly to the aesthetics and psychology of the movie. The use of the gaze and voice over for making meaning to reflect the psychological states of the characters is researched thoroughly. In accordance with this purpose, the techniques and elements which are relevant to this subject are mentioned including mise-en-scène, cinematography, film setting and decor.

Keywords: Psycho, Gaze, Voice Over

PSYCHO FİLMİNE KISITLI BİR BAKIŞ: BAKIŞ VE DIŞ SES ÜZERİNE

Öz

Hitchcock bu filmle korkuyu gündelik yaşam mekanlarına taşıdığı için Psycho (1960) korku türü açısından önem arz eder. Aynı zamanda anlatı yapısının yanı sıra dış sahnesinin kurgusu, merdiven sahnelerinin izleyicinin görüşünü kısıtlayan tanrı-gözü açısıyla çekimleri, dışsesin anlam yaratmadaki kullanımı, izleyici özdeşleşmesinin değişimi, psikolojik yönü ve film müziği gibi unsurlar ile de önemli bir yere sahiptir. Film, diğer filmlerdeki alıntılar ve göndermelerin yanısıra devam filmleri, öncesini anlatan bir dizi, hakkında bir belgesel, enstalasyon olarak sergilenmiş bir kopya olan temellük bir avangard film, filmin yapım sürecini konu edinen yarı biyografik bir film, cinayet sahnesinin klişe olması, hakkındaki sayısız kitap, inceleme ve makale ile sinema alanında gözardı edilemez bir etkiye sahiptir.

Psycho filmi öncelikle anlatı yapısı, film müziği ve psikanaliz gibi konularda inceleyen çalışmalar için elverişli bir filmidir. Bu çalışma, kısıtlı bir tema seçerek, filmde karakterlerin mekanlarla ilişkisiyle bağlantılı olarak bakış ve dış ses kullanımını çözümlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla filmdeki 'göz' ile yakın ilişkili olan metaforlar da irdelenmiştir. Bakış ve dış sesin karakterlerin psikolojik durumlarını yansıtmak amacıyla anlam yaratmada ne şekilde kullanıldığı irdelenmiştir. Bu amaçla, mizansen, görüntü yönetmenliği, film seti ve dekor gibi unsurları kapsayacak biçimde konuyla bağlantılı kullanılan yöntem ve unsurlara değinilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Psycho, Bakış, Dış Ses

* Asst. Prof. Dr., Istanbul University Faculty of Communication, Department of Radio Television and Cinema (Istanbul, Turkey), e.gulay.er@gmail.com

Makale geliş tarihi | Article arrival date: 04.05.2016

Makale kabul tarihi | Article acceptance date: 24.11.2016

INTRODUCTION

“What a ‘horrible pride,’ at moments, in Dad’s blind smile!”

Georges Bataille

Alfred Hitchcock, also called the ‘master’ of cinema, is one of the most-written about directors. His movies have given inspiration to many others. Brian De Palma, as a director renowned worldwide who is particularly famous for being a Hitchcock imitator with homages like *Body Double* (1984), *Sisters* (1973), *Dressed to Kill* (1980), *Carrie* (1976), *Obsession* (1975) and *Blow Out* (1981), per se sets an example of Hitchcock’s effect on cinema. As Thomas Leitch briefly stated, “No filmmaker has ever produced a more extended meditation on the work of another filmmaker than Brian De Palma. Nor has any filmmaker taken more critical drubbings than De Palma has for his borrowings from Hitchcock.” (2006: 251). Leitch refers to De Palma’s declarations on the topic, one of which is an amusing anecdote that shows us how Hitchcock put his artistic stamp on film as a director (2006: 251-252):

Asked on the release of *Body Double* why he kept reprising the shower scene from *Psycho*, he replied blandly: ‘If I’m attracted to something I shouldn’t refuse to use it just because Hitchcock was attracted to it too.’ Six years later, on the release of *The Bonfire of the Vanities* (1990) when questioned why he was so often accused of being derivative of Hitchcock, his response was snappier: ‘When you’re writing a story about Brian De Palma, that’s the spin. I could make Disney pictures from now on, and they’d still be talking about the shower scene I’d stolen from *Psycho*.’

When you speak of ‘Hitch’ called the ‘master of suspense’, motifs like spirals, stairs, windows and themes such as domineering mothers, queer men, doubles, transference of guilt, mystery - suspense - surprise, the big Other and the use of knowledge, his own obsessions like cleansing the bathroom, blondes, the useless police, melodramas blended with murder, use of the MacGuffin, Hitchcockian stains, his famous cameos, travelling shots, sound design and the use of score are the first things that come to mind. The ‘Vertigo effect’ is also named the ‘Hitchcock zoom’¹, after the director as well as his movie. Then it is really hard to limit the topic considering Hitchcock’s artistic vision and the connections among themes established through his filmography.

Psycho is adapted from Robert Bloch’s novel which is inspired by the story of the serial killer Ed Gein. Joseph Stefano, the screenwriter, worked hard with Alfred Hitchcock on the script. It diverges from the novel, in aspects like Marion’s part, the identity of Norman and the dialogues between Norman and his mother. After buying out the novel at a very low price of \$ 9000, Hitchcock bought as many copies as he could to keep the surprise ending of the movie secret. Hitchcock financed the movie and used the crew from his television series, so the total cost was \$ 800,000. This low-budget, black&white movie with studio shootings became one of the masterpieces of cinema. The opening titles, which are designed by Saul Bass, are the main subject of many articles. Bass also created

the storyboard for the shower scene. Who directed this scene became a controversial topic, although Hitchcock declared that Bass shot the scene in which the detective is going up the stairs before being killed but that he changed it during montage. Saul Bass was also the pictorial consultant of the film. *Psycho* owes a lot to Bernard Herrmann, the composer of the soundtrack. Almost everyone who writes about *Psycho* mentions the effect of the score, the slasher music and the shrieking violins of Herrmann's score in the murder scene, no matter what their topic is. Hitchcock is mentioned with Eisenstein with respect to his editing of the shower scene. Besides the shower scene, with regard to the staircase scenes, the use of sound, close-up shots, changing subjective/objective point of view shots, the movie is identified as pure cinema, or 'pure film', as Hitchcock called it.

Psycho became a classic and is still a source of inspiration. *Psycho's* effect on cinema can be seen in borrowings, allusions, quotations, remakes and repetitions of specific elements in other movies.² *Psycho II* (Richard Franklin, 1983) and *Psycho III* (Anthony Perkins, 1986) are sequels, *Psycho IV: The Beginning* (Mick Garris, 1990- TV Movie) is a prequel to *Psycho* and a sequel to *Psycho III*. In these three films Anthony Perkins played the part of Norman Bates. And there is also a documentary, *The Psycho Legacy* (Robert V. Galluzzo, 2010) which takes a look at *Psycho*, *Psycho II*, *Psycho III* and *Psycho IV: The Beginning*. Gus Van Sant made a shot-by-shot remake of the movie, also named *Psycho* (1998). A television movie, *Bates Motel* (Richard Rothstein, 1987) is a spin off of the movie. The TV series *Bates Motel* (2013-) can be defined as prequel since it tells the backstory of Norman Bates and his relationship with his mother. Douglas Gordon slowed down *Psycho* to two frames per second, instead of the usual 24 frames per second. This art installation is a 35 mm. film projection without sound and music called *24 Hour Psycho* (1993), which lasts twenty four hours and is considered to be an appropriation and is surely an avant-garde film.³ Alongside many significant books, *Alfred Hitchcock and the Making of Psycho* (1990) written by Stephen Rebello is beyond an ordinary biography or nonfiction book. It deals with every single detail in the process of creating *Psycho*. Also, there is a semi-biographic movie adapted from Rebello's book: *Hitchcock* (Sacha Gervasi, 2012).

Psycho is regarded as a hybrid movie containing elements of drama, psychological thriller and also detective films. Oliver suggests that "With the corpse of Norman's mother, which Norman stuffed like one of his birds, *Psycho* also plays at the boundary between thriller and horror" and points out correctly that with *Psycho* and *Birds* (1963) Hitchcock transformed and made the horror genre respectable by moving horror out of the realm of the fantastic and taking it into the realm of everyday life. This has become one of the formulaic elements of contemporary horror films (Oliver, 2008: 11). Especially, the murder scene presents the violation of the most secure and private place of everyday life, the bathroom. At the same time it appears to be a place where we are most defenseless and vulnerable. Also with the murder of Marion, Hitchcock leaves one MacGuffin and the other one takes over. To kill the leading actress one third of the way through the movie and then let the viewers side with the murderer then is sufficient for researches on its narrative structure. The most analyzed Hitchcock movie on the subject of gaze

is unarguably *Rear Window* (1954). Of course on the same subject *Psycho* is discussed too, mostly from a feminist perspective and almost all referring to Laura Mulvey's *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema* (1999). Yet *Psycho* is mostly analyzed from the perspective of psychoanalysis. These analyses mostly underline the 'monstrous mother', with references to *Powers of Horror* written by Julia Kristeva (1982) and Barbara Creed's *The Monstrous-Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis* (1993).

Hitchcock is famous for his travelling shots tracking the gaze of actors/actresses gaze. He is the 'master of gaze', as Kolker emphasized (2004: 119):

'Gaze theory' is essential to the understanding of films because both films and their audience are constructed through the way the camera looks at the characters, the characters look at each other, and - usually by means of editing - we are asked to look at both. Hitchcock was a master of the gaze. His films are largely structured on the interchange of looks, and he is especially fond of the kind of 'tracking' gaze, in which we see a character walking, intercut with a tracking shot of what or who the character is walking toward.

In this study I researched the interchange of the look which includes the metaphoric use of objects related also to the eye. But in the final instance it is the gaze of Hitchcock's camera after all. This study focuses on gaze and voice in relation to the leading actor's/actress's altered states of consciousness. To me *Psycho* talks about the impossibility of free will and also the psychological pressure of dead parents on liberation and emancipation. Abiding by this definition this study analyzes the movie with regard to the relationships between places, characters, the gaze and the voice and interprets the embodied metaphors in the movie.

AIM AND METHODOLOGY

This study aims to look into how Hitchcock makes use of voice over and gaze in terms of 'pure film'. Keeping this aim in mind, the function of gaze and voice over is analyzed regarding to the relationship between characters and places. With a hermeneutic approach the study aims to unveil the metaphors and implicit meanings referring to semiotics- if necessary. With this aim the embodied metaphors closely linked with 'the eye' in the movie are analyzed in line with the method used in the analysis of *Histoire de l'oeil* (Bataille, 1928), written by Roland Barthes. This is a case study on the movie *Psycho* and the themes are determinative for the limitation of the study.

FINDINGS

Hitchcock did not use voice over to narrate the story. The voice over is heard either as an offscreen voice which belongs to the acousmetre or as inner monologues of the characters. These inner monologues provide the meaning that allow the viewer to understand the psychological states of the characters. The asynchronous use of the visual and the audial enable viewers to identify their mental state.

The look transferred to nonliving things shows the oppression on the characters. It also helps make connections among the metaphors embedded in the movie. Metaphors of the look/eye which relate to holes indicate sexuality and death.

Gaze of the Thing

In *Psycho*, we see how the encumbrance of the dead parents/death of parents affect the characters' lives and makes them feel trapped. Sam struggles for people who are not actually in his life. He has to pay off his dead father's debts and pay alimony to his ex-wife. Under such circumstances he has no freedom to live his life in the way he wants to. His shop depicts his besetment, we see him surrounded by threatening objects he sells. Norman seems to become lost in his split identity, in consequence of his mother's dominance and his act of matricide which has led them to dwell together in his mind. Meanwhile Marion grew up as an orphan with Lila. She quit school and began to work. In the film, she has worked as a secretary for ten years in the same office.

Regarding the hotel scene, Marion seems to fly away with the money for the sake of her freedom; to steal the money to emancipate herself from her dreams befitting the normative structure of society, like marrying Sam and her dull job- her total ordinariness. She defines having a dinner with Sam respectably as 'in her house and with her mother's picture on the mantel', and also accompanied by her sister. To have sex they should send Lila to the movies and 'turn Mama's picture to the wall', as Sam says. The photograph of the mother represents the gaze of the mother and her look's existence is the approval of respectability, although it is a dead mother looking from the photograph. On the contrary, in Norman's mother's room, there is a portrait, most probably her mother's, hung on the wall above the bed, which she shared first with her husband and then her lover. But also, together with her dressing, giving us a hint about her personality, this suits the sculptures and the feminine Victorian design.

Photographs hung on the walls of her room are marked as seen while Marion is preparing to leave the city, packing her clothes. She is in the midst of her babyhood photographs, standing in front of her wardrobe. These photographs serve to indicate what kind of a woman this baby has grown into, getting into the act after meeting with Sam in a cheap hotel room during her lunch break in order to escape from ordinariness and also try to get an opportunity just for herself in her life. And there is a remarkable photograph of her parents. They do not look straight at Marion through the photograph but to the right out of the window. Since Hitchcock pays attention to every detail, this is an example of how he cares about the *mise-en-scène*. It is obvious that as the institution of family⁴ represents social norms, the family photos in her room are the reminders of normative rules for Marion. The cheap hotel room, her office and her room indicate that Marion is an ordinary woman. Turning off the highway also means to deviate from her ordinariness, and moreover, her masochistic passion for the vision she creates about Cassidy makes her a candidate for becoming a victim.

Hitchcock finds a use for paintings, mirrors and photographs in his *mise-en-scène*, lots of mirrors are used to highlight the doubling of the characters -especially for Marion and

Norman- and mirroring one's identity in the image of the other. Joseph W. Smith III. gives an example of how Hitchcock makes use of mirrors in this way (2009: 60-61):

At the same time, Marion and Norman's blocking on the porch precisely reverses their earlier exchange in the office. There, Norman stood at the right of the screen facing Marion at the left, and we could see her reflection in the mirror behind her; here, Marion is at the right, and Norman is at the left, while his reflection appears in the window behind him. This again links Marion and Norman, not only through positioning but also because they are both seen to have a 'second self.' Furthermore, the idea of a 'split personality' becomes even clearer if you look carefully at Norman's reflection in this scene - his 'double,' as it were. While the face of the 'real' Norman, seen from his right, bears a small and slightly awkward smile, the left side of Norman's face, as reflected in the windowpane, is grim and tight-lipped.

Paintings hung on the walls of the parlor and the drawings in the motel room evoke Norman's taxidermy. One of the paintings that covers the peephole so that it is out of sight is remarkable. It tells the story of Susanna and the elders, in the Book of Daniel (Chapter 13), in the Old Testament Apocrypha. "And they watched eagerly, day after day, to see her" and one day while Susanna bathes in her husband's garden two elders again watch her and then force her to lie with them, telling her that otherwise they will testify against her, saying that a young man was with her. Joseph W. Smith III asserts that although it is difficult to track down the artist or the title of the painting, most writers agree with Spoto (2009: 68). Like the elders Norman views Marion through the peephole hidden by this painting. While we watch her taking a shower, the camera serves for the pleasure of the viewers. And we know that it is also Norman's lust for Marion, not just the viewer's, like the elders "lustful desire to possess her"- to rape her or to murder her.

In a way, this painting reflects what Norman prepares to do and its meaning for Norman - to face the past (others in the swamp). For Norman, it is just like carrying on the conversation with Marion in the parlor under the menacing gaze of the birds he has stuffed. In Alfred Hitchcock's own words (Truffaut, 1985: 282):

I was quite intrigued with them: they were like symbols. Obviously Perkins is interested in taxidermy since he'd filled his own mother with sawdust. But the owl, for instance, has another connotation. Owls belong to the night world; they are watchers, and this appeals to Perkins' masochism. He knows the birds and he knows that they're watching him all the time. He can see his own guilt reflected in their knowing eyes.

While Norman is explaining the trap he was born into and talking about his mother, the framing changes and we see the owl above with outspread wings gazing on Norman cruelly as a bird of prey headed towards him. We again see the owl behind Norman when he peeps at Marion - the owl is also looking at him. Hitchcock gives a perfect example of his famous travelling shots, tracking Norman's gaze that shifts virtually in the direction of the house before he goes decidedly from the peephole to the house.

In addition to the look of the birds and the composition of the owl and Norman, paintings are also significant in contributing to the psychological effect on the mind of the viewer. Kolker comments (2004: 232-233):

Norman is photographed in a tilted composition, against painting of a classical nude and a rape- surrogates for his repressed sexuality- his stuffed owl seeming to swoop at his head. The paintings hint at Norman's deeply repressed sexuality and, although we have no idea at this point of the power his stuffed mother holds over him, there is a hint of the aggressiveness and violence to come in this composition, as the dead bird seems ready to pounce on Norman, as Mother pounces through Norman.

These objects have an implicit meaning for the characters and for the viewer as well. Hitchcock's composition, framing, the change of subjective/objective point of view shots creates this implication carefully, playing with the viewer's attention.

Voice of the Mother, Gaze of the House

Not only the motel and the house but the area including the swamp can be seen as Norman's playground and a safe area to absent himself from society. Since the highway was moved, the Bates Motel and house are isolated from the lively life. They stand apart, the Victorian style house⁵ is at the top and vertical in contrast with the horizontal motel. The motel looks like a modern building left behind by the transferred highway. They seem to be separated from each other and from the rest of the world. This situation and settlement provides not only a tension derived from the opposition but also the isolation, privateness and secrecy.

In *The Pervert's Guide to Cinema*, Žižek argues that the three floors of the house appear to reproduce the three floors of human subjectivity. The ground floor is the ego where Norman behaves as normal; whatever remains of his normal ego takes over there. The top floor represents the maternal superego since the dead mother basically is a figure of superego. And the cellar is the id. Norman's carrying his mother to the cellar is his act of transposing her in his own mind as a psychic agency from superego to id (Fiennes, 2006).

Tony Magistrale presents a different argument on this issue. The motel represents the part of his identity that gets in the mood of a bourgeois businessman and connects with other people. The house indicates the aspect of Norman that has been trapped in being nothing more than his mother's son, who is just a little boy. The house and the motel do not function as a home or business, but as a place where he is not a child, man or mother but trying to be all at once. The house is linked to Norman's superego, where he is most repressed, the motel to his ego, where he tries to present an acceptable social persona as the motel's manager, and the swamp to id, which is "associated with all the libidinal and self-destructive impulses that compel the Norman-mother amalgamation into tumultuous action throughout the film." (2005: 69, 70).

For the motel I interpret the office as superego, the parlor as ego and the bathroom as id. The office by necessity is superego- we see his persona (as Jung defines the term) in the office and in front of the office. Also, the look of the house represents the superego by giving orders (such as not inviting a stranger to dinner) or by Norman's reaction to his mother's murder. It is the house as seen from outside, from the motel. Norman and Marion talk intimately in the parlor while she eats. The parlor is the place where he

talks about his hobby, loneliness, mother and past, being aware of realities, as far as possible of course, while the birds he has stuffed are there as reminders of his guilt. It represents the oppressed ego of Norman. The bathroom, which as we know Hitchcock is obsessed with, is the place where he impersonates his mother, adopting her guise. Based upon the symbolic signs of the movie and via the repressed sexuality of Norman and the connection of drain and swamp, we can guess that he killed other girls there, too. The bathroom is the place where id takes over. The swamp seems to be the unconscious, an issue I will return to below. If the house reflects Norman's personality, the cellar seems to be the womb of the house, which overall represents the concept of the grave. In this case, the mother's transfer to the cellar is not only an act of hiding but also of preserving her.

Other than psychological explanations, Žižek defines the house and the motel historically. The first murder takes place in the motel, which epitomizes anonymous American modernity, and the second murder takes place in the Gothic house, which epitomizes American tradition. The opposition of the horizontal hotel and vertical house alongside signifying an unexpected historical tension between tradition and modernity, it epitomizes Norman as a mediator between tradition and modernity, divided between two locales and condemned to circulate endlessly between the two. Norman's split identity signifies the incapacity of American ideology to locate the present, actual society in a context of historical tradition (Žižek, 1992: 231, 232).

For the voice of the mother, Hitchcock hired three people who all read her lines, so the voice is a mixture of two female and a male voice (Smith III, 2009: 59). Norman's mother's voice is active offscreen sound, as Chion defines the term (1994: 85):

Active offscreen sound is used frequently in traditional sound-image editing, bringing objects and characters into a scene by means of sound, then showing them. Films like *Psycho* are based entirely on the curiosity aroused by active offscreen sound: this mother we keep hearing, what does she look like?

The mother herself is defined as 'the acousmetre' by Michel Chion. The acousmetre is the acousmatic character whose relationship to the screen involves a specific kind of ambiguity and oscillation and who is neither inside nor outside the image. Although it is not seen, the voice's source (the body, mouth) is also a part of the action. Chion asserts that fiction films grant three powers and a gift to the acousmetre: The power of seeing all, the power of omniscience, the omnipotence to act on the situation and the gift of ubiquity. The acousmetre's nature blurs the boundaries between onscreen and offscreen. The acousmetre's persona can maintain its status only as long as this distinction prevails in a meaningful way, and draws its force from the opposition and from the way it transgresses it (1994: 129-131). The scene in which Norman carries his mother down to the cellar is an interesting example of active offscreen sound and the acousmetre's nature blurring the boundaries between onscreen and offscreen. At last we see the person whom this active offscreen sound we hear belongs to, but we do not see her speaking and we do not see her mouth on account of the God's eye view angle.

It seems that Norman's mother takes advantage of the power of the acousmetre in the scene in which Marion hears their argument inside the house standing by the open window in her room. From that distance, it is impossible for Marion to hear them. Hitchcock tricks viewers regarding the spatial relation of sound and image. Cynthia Erb claims that as Norman is psychotic, Marion seems to be hearing things and the spatial experiment of Mother's voice is used to spread psychotic effect from one character to another. As Erb puts it (2006: 56):

From scene to scene spatial relations change, yet the tinny, sourceless quality of Mother's voice remains constant. Mother's voice spreads in the film, rupturing borders of inside/outside and subjective/objective. ... Put differently, the inscription of Mother's voice is consistently psychotic in the sense that it is never properly stabilized in space, either at the diegetic or extradiegetic levels (affecting the characters, affecting the spectator).

To interpret the meaning of this scene we must take into consideration that it is Norman who opens the window of her room. Hitchcock is playing with our perception and enjoying himself. It is a significant act, just like Norman's words 'I think only birds look well stuffed because... Well, because they're kind of passive to begin with.' when talking about taxidermy. And also it must be noted that when Mother and Norman speak, since it should be both of course, they either repeat the words or utter them stammeringly and indeterminedly.

If we consider a still image of the house, the following definition by Žižek in reference to Lacan saying "This window, if it gets a bit dark, and if I have reasons for thinking that there is someone behind it, is straight-away a gaze" in *Seminar* (1954) is appropriate (Žižek, 2001: 201):

Is this notion of the gaze not perfectly rendered by the exemplary Hitchcockian scene in which the subject is approaching some uncanny threatening object, usually a house? There we encounter the antinomy between the eye and the gaze at its purest: the subject's eye sees the house, but the house -the object- seems somehow to return the gaze.

Here, the house is a figuration of the identities of Norman and his mother - not only is the shadow of the mother figure seen before indicated here but also the memory of her and the immanent shadow of the one dwelling in his mind. The gaze of the house has a complicated structure that includes the gaze of the mother, the relationship between Norman and his mother, their private life and Norman as a son, all behind curtains; as it is framed when Marion listens to their quarrel or after the murder, from the same window. It is the gaze of the house. It throws its weight around to the full extent. It embodies Norma as the maternal superego, Norma-Norman and Norman as a boy. The windows of the Bates House should not be seen just as a metaphor of the eye. They serve as a scene where an illusion is displayed for Marion by Hitchcock and/or Norman, whether via image (she sees the image of the mother as a shadow when she first gets to the motel) or sound (the quarrel between Norman and his mother), and there is another illusion displayed only for

the viewer via sound (after the murder). Sartre comments on the perception of a place or an object as the eye itself, not as the representation of the eye, not as the representation of 'the actual eye of the watcher hidden behind' (1978: 257-258):

Of course what most often manifests a look is the convergence of two ocular globes in my direction. But the look will be given just as well on occasion when there is a rustling of branches, or the sound of a footstep followed by silence, or the slight opening of a shutter, or a light movement of a curtain. During an attack men who are crawling through the brush apprehend as a look to be avoided, not two eyes, but a white farm-house which is outlined against the sky at the top of a little hill. ... Now the bush, the farmhouse are not the look; they only represent the eye, for the eye is not at first apprehended as a sensible organ of vision but as the support for the look. They never refer therefore to the actual eye of the watcher hidden behind the curtain, behind a window in the farmhouse. In themselves they are already eyes.

The house itself is the gaze upon the motel and a fixed gaze on Norman. In each scene we see Norman going in or coming out of the house and the house is framed in its entirety, as a gothic identity of a being standing upwards in the dark. It casts the shadow of its very being on Norman. For Norman, the identity of the house includes his mother's identity in the way that he perceives: The one which seems to be the figure of maternal superego accusing and guarding him which is dwelling in his mind, and also the image which belongs to his childhood and which he was overdependent on, namely the transcendent figure of dominant mother independent of time, which are indissoluble for ages. Of course, these are alongside his sense of self and life experiences which are most traumatic, yet he did not leave the place once in his lifetime.

It is obvious that Norman's and his mother's bedrooms reflect their minds, their inner worlds. His mother's room is furnished in Victorian style. Norman's room still looks like a boy's room, it looks childish with all the toys and other details. It is clear that Norman did not touch anything, did not change a thing in the house after the death of his mother, and he also preserved her room much the same as it was when she was alive. He not only keeps her alive in his mind but he also keeps her as an inhabitant of the house even though as a mummy. In addition, he has kept his own room as his mama's boy's room. Wood states that 'Lila's exploration of the house is an exploration of Norman's psychotic personality.' He correctly claims that the whole sequence has clear Freudian overtones, the Victorian decor intensifies the atmosphere of sexual repression and Norman's bedroom represents his conscious mental development: A strange confusion of the childish and the adult (2004: 80). From this perspective, the house seems to be frozen at a certain point in time. Matricide causes the house to turn into a personal museum in a way, with all its stillness.

Steven Jacobs draws a parallel between the house and a tomb (2007: 134):

The uncanny house is literally connected with death and functions as a funerary monument. The discovery in the basement makes clear that the entire house, and the mother's room in particular, make up a tomb. Like an Egyptian pharaoh, mother has been mummified and buried with her household belongings. Given this perspective, the crammed Bates house incarnates the womb/tomb rhyme that preoccupies house-building in many cultures.

In *Psycho*, the spatial entity of the Bates House seems to be a character in the movie that also contributes its phantasmatic image to the movie's atmosphere. As Lila walks in the rooms of Norman and his mother, she disturbs their privacy. We enter their private sphere and surpass personal boundaries, violating the inner world of the house in the same way as the camera in the opening sequence.

The Voyeuristic Look of the Camera

The opening scene starts with a bird's eye view of Phoenix, with the camera tending towards the window to get into a hotel room under the blind, violating the intimacy between Marion and Sam. We, the viewers of the movie, violate this intimacy via the camera. Hitchcock said that the camera movement in this scene allows the viewer to become a Peeping Tom (Truffaut, 1985: 266). Laura Mulvey defines this camera movement as penetration (2004: 234):

This act of penetration prefigures subsequent violations of space throughout the rest of the movie, of which the violent intrusion into the enclosed space of the shower, combined with the knife's penetration of Marion's body, are only the most remarkable and shocking.

With this shot Hitchcock gives a hint that we're going to deal with the threatening birds issue. It is impossible not to catch the hesitation of the camera that gives the feeling of the flight of a bird. This hesitation is the first indication we have of the birds. Then come Norman's taxidermia and the names like Phoenix or Crane. And the hesitation of the camera movement is to be linked to Norman's hesitation when choosing which key to give Marion.

Another example of the viewer becoming a voyeur is the shower scene. As a result of the talk about traps in the parlor, Marion seems to have decided to go back to Phoenix, return the money and fit into society. Due to this decision, the meaning of the shower scene is seen as purification. But the shooting implies something else. Here, Marion becomes the object for the voyeuristic look of the camera as a replacement for the viewer's eye. Hitchcock did not choose for the viewer to see her through Norman's eyes. He leaves the parlor just before she goes into the shower. He does not need to stay longer, as she was already 'objet petit a' for Norman; a young and attractive woman travelling alone whom he can desire. Marion also poses a threat to his split personality by talking disrespectfully about his mother and suggesting taking her away from home, from him.

William Rothman suggests that the shower head is not only an eye but also Marion's imaginary partner, and that Marion's shower is a love scene: "Marion sees the shower head only as the source of her pleasure, while we see this 'eye' as the source of views that arouse our appetite and promise satisfaction of our desire." (2012: 300, 302). His interpretation of the shower head as the imaginary partner could be seen as an over-statement. But what the viewer witnesses here is not the purification of herself by the flow of the water but a highly erotic scene. The objective point of view shooting, altering angles and changing the position of the camera provides almost a theatrical play for the viewer which is not indicative of purification.

Empathetic Gaze

Viewers side with Marion although she is a thief due to the long road scenes of her escape and then after she is killed, they take sides with Norman. When he cleans up the bathroom after the murder or when he waits for Marion's car to sink into the swamp, we all share his anxiety. Norman cleaning up the bathroom and Marion preparing to escape with the money in her room are the scenes of experimentation with the psychological states of the characters. Marion is on the verge of making a choice. As Rothman indicates below (2012: 269):

Throughout this passage, the camera stands outside Marion and scrutinizes her like an entomologist studying an insect. Even when the camera appropriates her perspective, it stands neutrally apart, taking note of the gravitational pull exerted on her gaze by the money-filled envelope. Yet we are also attuned to her behavior as if from within.

By means of shots tracking her gaze and the insertion of close-up shots of the money and the suitcase, together with objective point of view shots, this scene imparts to us her feeling of anxiety.

In another example, while we wait with Norman for her car to sink, we do not just see Norman waiting. When it stops for a moment we get anxious just as Norman does and we feel his uneasiness. Here, the viewer's gaze fits Žižek's definition (1992: 223):

The shift - the rotation - at work here could also be defined as the passage from I to a: from gaze as point of symbolic identification to gaze as object. That is to say, before he/she identifies with the persons from diegetic reality, the viewer identifies with him- or herself as pure gaze - that is, with the abstract point which gazes upon the screen.

Hitchcock says that it is a general rule, a natural instinct and draws a parallel with feeling anxious for a burglar while he is searching the drawers: "When Perkins is looking at the car sinking in the pond, even though he's burying a body, when the car stops sinking for a moment, the public is thinking, 'I hope it goes all the way down!'" (Truffaut, 1985: 273). Žižek interprets this scene as follows (1992: 223):

By means of the shift from I to a, however, the viewer is forced to face the desire at work in his/her seemingly 'neutral' gaze - here, it suffices to recall the well-known scene from *Psycho* where Norman Bates nervously observes the car containing Marion's body submerging in the swamp behind his mother's house: when the car stops sinking for a moment, the anxiety that automatically arises in the viewer - a token of his/her solidarity with Norman - suddenly reminds him or her that his/her desire is identical to Norman's: that his impartiality was always-already false. At this moment, his/her gaze is de-idealized, its purity blemished by a pathological stain, and what comes forth is the desire that maintains it: the viewer is compelled to assume that the scene he witnesses is staged for his eyes, that his/her gaze was included in it from the very beginning.

Hitchcock remarked that it is ‘the emotions of Peeping Tom audiences’ which cause the viewer’s tendency to identify with the character. In addition to these emotions, the knowledge of Norman’s motives given in the parlor scene helps the viewer to empathize with him when he cleans the bathroom or waits for Marion’s car to sink.

Marion’s Smile

Apart from the extension that serves to increase the effect of the murder of the leading actress and distract the viewer, such as the scenes with the state trooper and in which Marion trades in of her car in a used car lot, the driving sequence should be emphasized. Marion’s imagination of what will happen afterwards is given by inner monologue. So as not to distract the audience Hitchcock prefers not to shoot these scenes, leaving it up to the viewers to visualize it pursuant to voice over. Hitchcock demonstrates the possibilities of voice over in this sequence. In Marion’s inner monologue, she creates dialogues for other people and by using voice over in this way Hitchcock allows us to see inside Marion’s mind. These imagined dialogues reflect her visions of the people for whom she creates them and we also see how she reacts. The inner monologue and her reactions show us her psychological state. With this sequence the plot evolves into the darkness, into the night.

As she continues her existence through her murder in two thirds of the movie she is also absent from her own interior monologue. The inner monologue links Marion’s neurosis to Norman’s psychosis. Joseph W. Smith III. says that *Psycho* tends to foreground similarities between Norman and Marion starting with their names and states that they are linked by their ability to supply disembodied voices, to create dialogue for someone else and to reproduce someone else’s personality (2009: 51). He expresses briefly (2009: 50):

To persist in a course of action that she knew was wrong for well over 24 hours must have required her to distance herself from herself, to forcefully set aside her conscience- a marked splitting of the personality that links her pretty clearly to Norman. To put it simply, they show us the profound fragmentation of Marion’s psyche.

The tones of the voices are significant because they show her evaluation of the characters, her real thoughts about them, and after all it is all her interior monologue. So, the tone of the voice, expression and content, especially Sam’s and Cassidy’s, is important. Sam is immediately forgotten and erased totally from her imagination and also from the course of her life. And her smiles seem to be important too. First, the smile on her face freezes when she sees her boss looking at her suspiciously. It is the presence of ‘the Other’s look’ (Sartre, 1978: 262):

Shame reveals to me that I am this being, not in the mode of ‘was’ or of ‘having to be’ but in-itself. When I am alone, I can not realize my ‘being-seated’; at most it can be said that I simultaneously both am it and am not it. But in order for me to be what I am, it suffices merely that the Other look at me. It is not for myself, to be sure; I myself shall never succeed at realizing this being-seated which I grasp in the Other’s look. I shall remain forever a consciousness. But it is for the Other.

The second one is significant as a manifestation of her mental state. Tom Cassidy is the father figure who would cast his shadow over his daughter's marriage by buying her a \$ 40,000 house as a wedding present. She smiles when Cassidy plays his role in her mind and takes pleasure in her revenge on him, which gives her strength against this kind of man, for his impudence and vulgarity, while fleeing with his money which Cassidy can afford to lose, as he said before. And this smile is creepy, just like Norman's. When she hears him say 'I'll get it back if any of it's missing, I'll replace it with her fine, soft flesh! I'll track her, never you doubt it.', she smiles like an angel of vengeance. Here, voice over assumes the function of the look, in the way that Sartre points out (1978: 269):

First, the Other's look as the necessary condition of my objectivity is the destruction of all objectivity for me. The Other's look touches me across the world and is not only a transformation of myself but a total metamorphosis of the world.

It is masochistic but yet it is all her dark fantasy. It is this smile, in addition to giving Norman a fake name and home address, mentioning putting his mother in an institution and Hitchcock's emphasis on the word 'OKAY' written on the newspaper in which Marion wraps up the money and which is seen several times, that implies Marion is to be killed. Hitchcock encourages the murder, it is OKAY to murder the leading actress so early for the sake of the narrative. He confirms it when we see the word again in the scene after the murder, from the view of camera which goes in the room, looks directly at the newspaper and then to the house.

In this sequence, Hitchcock sets the mood for the darkness she is stepping into. First, we share Marion's anxiety with the help of subjective point of view shots, and side with Marion. As it gets dark, the heavy rain and the disturbing blinding headlights of the cars increase her mental strain and the music increases the tension. The mood of the sequence is getting worse and by degrees it is only Marion's face we see due to lighting and close ups. It is obvious that she has lost insight as she heads from the dark realm of her fantasies towards Norman's dark realm of a perverted mind.

Norman's Smile

While the psychiatrist explains the case to the police, Lila and Sam, Norman sits and waits in a room at the police station. At last, he will be 'put in one of those places, an institution, a madhouse' as proposed for his mother previously. Moreover, Norma Bates has now taken possession of his mind completely. She declares that she is harmless and says, condemning her son 'as if I could do anything except just sit and stare, like one of his stuffed birds' as voice over and as the camera zooms in. Just like Norman stated before in the parlor: 'She's as harmless as one of those stuffed birds'. In the end, we see Norman sitting still, raising his gaze to us and smiling creepily; a smile like that of Marion upon hearing Cassidy in her mind, the same lunatic smile. These in-text allusions help establish the causal logic of the narrative, as a shift from Marion to Norman. The mummified skull of Norma Bates is superimposed over Norman's face in compliance with the fact that she has seized the reins as the dominant personality.

When Norman looks directly at the camera and us, viewers are subjected to his insane look. Willemen, referring primarily to Lacan and then Sartre, describes the fourth look⁶ as “the look which constitutes the viewer as visual subject.” It is the look that the character gives the viewer, looking at us from the screen. Willemen proposes that “... the fourth look is not of the same order as the other three, precisely because the subject of the look is an imaginary other, but this doesn’t make the presence of the look any the less real.” (1976: 47-48). The terms ‘the look back’, ‘the returned gaze’, ‘the gaze of the screen’ are also used and this, as Wheeler Winston Dixon says, is “an integral function of all cinema” (1995: 7). Erb defines the function of Norman’s last look and voice of the mother as, “the culminating psychotic spreading of voice and gaze seeks to dissolve distinctions between character and viewer, spectator and screen.” (2006: 56). Žižek deals with the look back from the stand point of the viewer (1992: 234-245) :

The crucial feature with regard to the allegorical functioning of *Psycho* is that at this precise moment when, finally, the Voice finds its body, Norman - in the penultimate shot of the film which immediately precedes ‘The End’ - raises his gaze and looks directly into the camera (i.e. into us, the viewers) with a mocking expression which displays his awareness of our complicity ... what we obtain at the end is a Hegelian answer: we always-already partake in the absolute Otherness which returns the gaze. ... The unique gaze into the camera which ends Norman’s monologue and then dissolves into the mother’s skull - this gaze which addresses us, the viewers - separates us from the symbolic community and makes us Norman’s accomplices.

Norman’s penetrating look in response to the idea of putting his mother in an institution makes us think that this offer would help him make his mind up about what to do with the woman who has suggested this awful idea. With the change of angles and position of the camera, the parlor sequence is a study of psychology as well, of course, in addition to Perkins’s acting. The penetrating look Norman gives is an alarm signal about his fears. And now what he was alarmed at happens to him and what he fears for his mother comes true. Miran Bozovic interprets his situation by asking (2004: 253):

Does it not seem, then, as if Norman has been stuffed while still alive, since all he is capable of doing henceforth is representing himself? ... Isn’t Norman, then, condemned to exemplify, with his body, “a farther use of the dead” even before his death?

It seems that he fell into another trap, from which he can only be freed in the sequels.

We hear Norma Bates’s thoughts as voice over monologue and see Norman Bates, not saying a word but expressing her thoughts. As mentioned above, the mix of three voices is used to perform the mother’s voice, except for this monologue, which is Virginia Gregg’s voice. This constitutes a meaningful whole as the mother’s personality gains dominion over Norman’s. The viewer is entrapped by Hitchcock this time, not knowing whom to blame. Once again, Hitchcock makes a great display of the use of voice over in this scene, making meaning by allusions within the text and consequently demonstrating the possibilities of cinema.

Hitchcock Presents: The Metaphor of the Eye

As we see, the eye and the look maintain their importance throughout the movie. George Toles says that “The film as a whole is equally concerned with the process by which eyes surrender their identity (or life) to Norman.” (2004: 131). The look of the photographs, the look of Marion’s boss when he meets her on the road... the look of the policeman hidden under his sunglasses... the look of the salesman and again the policeman in the used car lot... the cruel look of the birds... Marion’s look towards us in the frontal shot... things we can’t see but she sees in the rear view mirror... the face of the killer Arbogast sees but the viewer can not, we can only see the expression on his face... All these bring us to the metaphors of the eye.

Regarding the metaphor of the eye, Bataille’s *Histoire de l’oeil (Story of the Eye)*⁷ comes first to mind. Roland Barthes’s *The Metaphor of the Eye* presents a key approach to analyzing the concept. Barthes’s analysis of the metaphor of the eye in *Histoire de l’oeil* is applicable to *Psycho* if we consider differential characteristics of the medium. Barthes says that an object can have a story, a story of migration by passing from hand to hand, passing from image to image. He says, “the cycle of the avatars it traverses far from its original being, according to the tendency of a certain imagination which distorts yet does not discard it” (1972: 239). In *Psycho*, we also see the variations of the image. Barthes clearly analyzes the usage of the metaphor of the eye in *Histoire de l’oeil* (1972: 240-241):

Histoire de l’oeil is, then, a metaphoric composition (we shall see that metonymy nonetheless intervenes subsequently): one term, the Eye, is here varied through a certain number of substitutive objects which sustain with it the strict relation of affinitive objects (since they are globular) and yet dissimilar objects too (since they are variously named); this double property is the necessary and sufficient condition of every paradigm: the Eye’s substitutes are actually declined, in all the senses of the term: recited like the inflectional forms of the same word; revealed as the states of the same identity; eluded like propositions no one of which can detain us more than the rest; extended like the successive moments of the same story. Thus, in its metaphoric trajectory, the Eye both abides and alters: its fundamental form subsists through the movement of a nomenclature, like that of a topological space; for here each inflection is a new name and utters a new usage. The Eye seems, then, the matrix of a new trajectory of objects which are in a sense the different ‘stations’ of the ocular metaphor.

Barthes says that once posited as invariant elements, the feature of variation - of form and of content- permits new metaphorical extensions. It is of form and of function, in the case of *Psycho*- rotundity of the eye and hole. The peeping scene and the shower sequence have significant examples. The look on the face of Norman standing between the birds he has stuffed before he takes the painting shows us that he is on the point of ‘getting the guts up’ to do something relating to his psychosis. The peephole under this painting is a big hollow which has a hole in the center resembling the pupil of an eye.

Norman's eye and the peephole fill the frame. Norman's eye is seen in extreme close-up while peeping at Marion, and we see her through his eyes. The notion of the eye is transferred to nonliving things and objects, as seen in the look of the photographs and in the inanimate gaze of the stuffed birds. The peephole is clearly a metaphor for the eye in terms of both shape and function.

It is the same for the mother's mummified skull, the empty eyesockets link the eye with the hole since there is a hole in the middle of them and they themselves look directly like deep dark holes due to the lamp's motion. Mother's empty eyesockets and the look of the stuffed birds are directly linked with death- dead but still looking at Norman. The eyesockets serve for metaphorical variance as hole, death and lack of vision, like the abyss that the drain also is... Then comes the objects in the bathroom. Barthes says that Bataille's image is concerted (1972: 244, 245):

... it is neither a wild image nor even a free image, for the coincidence of its terms is not aleatory, round and the syntagm is limited by a constraint: that of selection, which obliges us to choose the terms of the image from only two finite series. This constraint, obviously, generates a very powerful kind of information, located at an equal distance from the banal and the absurd, since the narrative is encompassed by the metaphorical sphere, whose regions it can exchange (whence its energy) but whose limits it cannot transgress (whence its meaning); according to the law which decrees that the Being of literature is never anything but its technique, the insistence and the freedom of this 'song' are therefore products of an exact art which is able at once to measure the associative field and to liberate within it the contiguities of terms.

From this viewpoint, the images can also be selected from only two finite series in *Psycho*. The peephole, eyesockets, toilet, drain, plughole and shower head are double variations of the eye and hole couple, both in form and function- rotundity and the hole to look through or to flow down. Marion's open mouth helps to create an erotic tension in the shower scene and I wonder if Hitchcock told her to do this. While Norman stabs her several times, we see her mouth wide open again, screaming. It involves the image of both the round shape and the hole and is tied to the image of the eye. The shower head seems similar to the pupil of the eye and the flow of the water over Marion implies refreshment and purification. An illusion before the murder... But at the same time, it clearly alludes to Norman's sexual repression as the urge that forces him to murder her. And also by the wide open mouth's dual use -erotic and screaming- Hitchcock links sexuality to death. It is the same drain into which the pouring water and Marion's blood flow. We see another example when Marion flushes the pieces of paper on which she had made calculations of her spending after deciding to return the money and then tore up. This provides criminal evidence of her guilt that is later found by Lila. Again a round shape and a hole enables her to get rid of the evidence by the flow of water. It is much the same as the drain her blood goes into. The drain is directly connected to the eye in the murder scene. The camera zooms into the drain until it fills the frame and is superimposed over an extreme close-up of Marion's eye looking at us, while the spiral move of the camera is in parallel with the bloody water's flow. There is also the plughole we see when Norman washes his hands of Marion's blood, as a metaphor that is the same as

the drain. And the wash basin is notable also, circular and with a hole, in the same form as the toilet bowl. Hitchcock insists on these images and the viewer does not have an option to choose: The toilet bowl fills the majority of the frame, a jump cut to an extreme close up of her wide-open mouth, close up of the shower head seen four times and also the drain and Marion's dead eye fill the frame. How Hitchcock dealt with this issue can be seen in the example below (Smith III, 2009: 76, 77):

After nailing the shot, Hitchcock found that the initial close-up of Marion's eye wasn't the right size. Using an optical printer, he enlarged the shot to match the drain that is superimposed over her eye.

Also, cameras in that era didn't have auto-focus, so the focus had to be adjusted by hand while the shot was being filmed. This was especially difficult due to the shot's length.

We see that unwanted things like the ripped pieces of paper and Marion's blood go away with the flow of the water. But where? Symbolically into the swamp... The swamp's absorption of the corpses of Arbogast and Marion plays a decisive role in this conclusion. If they had been enclosed in a coffin and/or buried in the ground this could not be asserted. The evidence of guilt seems to accumulate in the swamp, and the swamp symbolically absorbs all as well as the corpses and the belongings of the dead. They are going to come into the picture; a piece of paper found by Lila and Marion's car rising out of the swamp. The swamp, collects the repressed (since Norman cleans up the mess his mother got into), the unwanted, the evidence of crime and guilt within, and thus indicates denial, guilt, warding off, escape and repression- also taking into consideration that its location is not certain- symbolizing the unconscious. In the way Norman carries his mother to the cellar to hide her, to protect her- in addition to the protection of taxidermy- the swamp hides and protects⁸ the ones he desired and killed.

If we get back to the murder scene and keep in mind that the murderer is the mother and Norman cleans the place up for her sake, the sound of the shower which continues running makes sense since it goes on 'as if nothing had happened'. After zooming out of her dead eye, the camera moves like a person who leaves Marion lying on the floor of the bathroom, goes into the room, looks at the newspaper, and after seeing the word 'OKAY' as a mark again, looks at the house, hears Norman shouting (referring to the scene where Marion hears them arguing) and sees him coming out of the house. The camera explicitly serves as an eye through which we see. This shot enables the movie to change course and paves the way for the viewer to segue onto Norman's side, like a transition zone. The camera's movement per se and the shooting from its point of view provides supplementary contribution to the sound of the shower that continues running during this shot. The function of the shower's sound is explained briefly by Chion (1994: 9):

The anempathetic effect is most often produced by music, but it can also occur with noise- when, for example, in a very violent scene after the death of a character some sonic process continues, like the noise of a machine, the hum of a fan, a shower running, as if nothing had happened. Examples of these can be found in Hitchcock's *Psycho* (the shower) and Antonioni's *The Passenger* (an electric fan).

And there is a generally ignored scene of Norman looking down on the swamp at night. Norman just stands still in the middle of nowhere. A scene of virgin nature free from humans and man-made structures -except for Norman and a white object that he obviously placed on the tree at the point where it divides into two main trunks. He seems to us like a natural element of this wilderness. We see Sam searching for Arbogast crying out his name in front of the motel. Norman slowly turns his head as if the echo of Sam's shout has reached him and looks not directly at us but towards us. Sam's shouting in the opposite direction and the way both look to their right, give the meaning 'as if' here. In this profile shot, as he turns his face towards us, we see that only the front of his face is deliberately left in darkness by the lighting and high contrast. He turns straight-facedly and his toneless, sphinx-like look makes him seem as if he has totally lost his sense of self. It must also be noted that this is a case of emergency; he has killed Arbogast out of necessity, as a must, not as a murder of passion. His look, which is compatible with the eerie atmosphere of the place, assigns a meaning closely related to the uncanny. As Toles puts it so precisely, "Norman's murders are attempts to eliminate a thought that must not take form. Killing is, paradoxically, the deepest place of forgetting." (2004: 140). This place almost does not belong to physical geography. It is not deeply bound up with the material world, only echoes of which can reach there. He just stands in a depersonalized state right beside the swamp. As he remains composed, this shot gives the viewer the feeling of nothing being real; his emotional state is virtually impenetrable to us. What we get from this shot is perhaps merely a feeling of nothingness. This scene goes along with the suggestion that the swamp symbolizes the unconscious.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Bataille says that: "The entire Story of the Eye was woven in my mind out of two ancient and closely associated obsessions, eggs and eyes, ..." (1987: 92). In the case of *Psycho*, it is the eye and hole in which transitional contact of metaphorical objects is grounded. Bataille and Hitchcock, impressed with the works of Freud, both convey meaning through metaphors which are in touch with Freud and make use of metaphors for the psychological context of the work, not for the construction of it. Bataille also says (1987, 101):

Today, I know I am 'blind,' immeasurable, I am man 'abandoned' on the globe like my father at N. No one on earth or in heaven cared about my father's dying terror. Still, I believe he faced up to it, as always. What a 'horrible pride,' at moments, in Dad's blind smile!

Bataille's words remind us that *Psycho's* leading actor/actress seem to be on their own like Bataille's abandoned father. The world is a lost paradise for Marion beginning from her childhood. This can be seen in her ordinary bourgeois life style and dreams about the future that she abandons. Marion seems to exemplify the norm that is in complete contrast to Norman and the Bates mansion. The places related to Marion denote the ordinariness that she abandons. In contrast, the parlor and the Bates house qualify for psychoanalytic study. There is pride in their smiles (when Marion is driving and Nor-

man's last smile) but also, we can see in them an omnipotence that is in close touch with lunacy.

The knife is frequently defined as a phallic object and the murder as a symbolic rape. It can be said that the metaphoric objects of the hole imply the vaginal. This conclusion also attains significance considering that going up or down the stairs represents the sexual act (Freud, 2010), and this is also the act of ego going between the superego and the id. The staircase which separates the house from the motel - aside from signifying gothic-modern duality - and the staircase inside the house affirm this psychoanalytic definition. In Lacanian terms, the name of the father, desire and big other (beginning with mother) issues are actualized in the character of the murderer, along with the absence of the father, which is notable in the case of not just Norman but also Marion. From this perspective, the metaphors around the hole and the eye carry implicit meanings.

The gaze is transferred to nonliving things like the photographs, the stuffed birds and the Bates mansion. The house embodies the gaze of the (maternal) superego, especially on Norman and the motel. The birds are on the watch, staring at Norman with their blaming eyes. The look of the Other positions Marion as a fugitive and guilty, which she is in reality. Along with these, the gaze of camera and altering subjective/objective point of view shots place the notion of 'the look' at the center of the movie. Camera's point of view shots or changing position/angle of the camera accompanying objective point of view shots help viewers become voyeurs, together with the voyeurism (as an action or as a concept) in the movie. Voice over is used in close connection with the neurosis/psychosis of the characters. And the character's look in these scenes posits his/her mental state. In his use of voice over Hitchcock gives a demonstration of how to make meaning through the asynchronous use of the visual and the aural.

The look/eye related to the hole links sexuality to death, as seen in the empty eyesockets of the mother's skull, which implies that the 'desire for mother' is hidden behind 'murdering the mother'; or as seen when the drain dissolves into Marion's dead eye- the inanimate look of the dead person that is as inanimate as other objects of the metaphor. In this context, another voyeuristic gaze takes place: The look Norman turns on his mother and her lover (as a replacement of primal scene) guides him to murder. Again this is an indication of desiring and killing; sexuality and death. This can also be heard in the imagined dialogue of Cassidy, as a voice over.

Bataille, in search of various modes of eroticism, such as physical, emotional and religious eroticism and its inner meaning, argues in *Eroticism: Death and Sensuality* that "In essence, the domain of eroticism is the domain of violence, of violation. What does physical eroticism signify if not a violation of the very being of its practitioners? -a violation of bordering on death, bordering on murder?" (1986: 16, 17). But he speaks of death for the sake of the continuity of existence. In the movie it is the opposite; for Norman, it is repressed sexuality and for Marion, it is sexual freedom, that is to say, not to have sexual intercourse with anyone, freedom from it just for herself, just the feeling of freedom. However, what Bataille says is still the essence of the motive for killing in Norman's case due both to the impossibility of performance and repression.

ENDNOTES

¹ This dolly-zoom technique was conceived by Sergiu Huzum but first used by Irmin Roberts in *Vertigo* (Alfred Hitchcock, 1958).

² See Constantine Verevis. (2006). For Ever Hitchcock: Psycho and Its Remakes. In David Boyd and R. Barton Palmer (Ed.), *After Hitchcock: Influence, Imitation, and Intertextuality* (15- 29). Austin, USA: University of Texas Press.

³ See Justin Remes. (2015). *Motion(less) Pictures: The Cinema of Stasis*. New York, USA: Columbia University Press.; Laura Mulvey. (2006). *Death 24x a Second: Stillness and the Moving Image*. London, UK: Reaktion Books.

⁴ In the office, Caroline offers Marion some pills, the tranquilizers her mother's doctor gave her the day of her wedding if she has a headache. William Rothman interprets this offer according to the fact that Pat Hitchcock, Alfred Hitchcock's daughter plays the role of Caroline: "Presumably it was not the prospect of the ceremony that filled Caroline with apprehension. That her mother's doctor prescribed the tranquilizers suggests that it was a tradition of the women in her family to face sex only in a tranquilized state.(...) And by casting his own daughter Pat in this role, Hitchcock makes a joking suggestion that the sexless marriage alluded to is his own." (Rothman, 2012:266). In this regard Marion and Caroline are opposing characters and this dialogue takes place after Marion returns to the office from the hotel room where she talked about respectability and marriage with Sam after having sex with him. Thus Hitchcock makes a mention of social conservatism on the issue of sexual freedom and society's attitude towards the concept of marriage. Another casting associated with real life is Anthony Perkins playing cross-dressing killer Norman. Poole states that since Perkins had professed his identity as a bisexual and had relationships with popular male stars of the day, "Hitchcock's casting of Anthony Perkins in this coded queer role further shades the character." He suggests that "Perhaps one dimension of the 'private trap' Norman professes to be in involves his sexual identity... If Norman had been able to embrace a queer point of view, he may have opened the door of his trap, stretching his wings and flying to freedom. Instead, he remains locked in his disturbed world and, as the film progresses, becomes murderously mad." (Poole, 2008). I think this is overinterpretation, since Poole assumes that cross-dressing behavior is associated with homosexuality. This opinion is questionable, since linking crossdressing only to homosexuality is not correct scientifically and also insufficient for the character's development in the movie. In Norman's case it is clear that it is not an act that gives him sexual satisfaction so crossdressing must be considered through his split personality.

⁵ For inspirations of the house see Steven Jacobs. (2007). *The Wrong House: The Architecture of Alfred Hitchcock*. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers.

⁶ The look of the camera recording the event, the look of the audience at the screen, the look of the characters at each other within the film are the other three looks. See Francesco Casetti. (1998). *Inside the Gaze: The Fiction Film and Its Spectator*. Bloomington and Indianapolis,USA: Indiana University Press.

⁷ It is also published, including Susan Sontag's "*The Pornographic Imagination*" and Roland Barthes' "*The Metaphor of the Eye*" as the foreword in Turkish edition with the title "Gözün Hikayesi" (N. Berna Serveryan and Ayşegül Gürsöy, trans., 2001, İstanbul: Çiviyazıları).

⁸ Swamp/mud protects corpses and mummifies them due to natural conditions like low temperature and lack of oxygen, by force of physical feature and chemical properties.Corpse mummified by this natural process are known as 'bog body' or 'bog mummy'.

REFERENCES

- Barthes, R. (1972). *Critical Essays* (R. Howard, Trans.) Evanston: Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1964).
- Bataille, G. (1986). *Erotism: Death and Sensuality* (M. Dalwood, Trans.). San Francisco: City Lights Books. (Original work published 1957).
- Bataille, G. (1987). *Story of the Eye* (J. Neugroschel, Trans.). San Francisco: City Lights Books. (Original work published 1928).
- Bozovic, M. (2004). Of Farther Uses of the Dead to the Living: Hitchcock and Bentham. In R. Allen & S. Ishii-González (Eds.), *Hitchcock: Past and Future* 243-256. London, New York, UK, USA: Routledge.
- Chion, M. (1994). *Audio - Vision: Sound on Screen* (C. Gorbman, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dixon, W. W. (1995). *It Looks At You: The Returned Gaze of Cinema*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Erb, C. (2006). Have You Ever Seen the Inside of One of Those Places?: Psycho, Foucault, and the Postwar Context of Madness. *Cinema Journal*, 45(4) (Summer, 2006), 45-63. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/4137167.pdf?_=1461493456970
- Freud, S. (2010). *The Interpretation of Dreams* (J. Strachey, Trans.). New York: Basic Books.
- Jacobs, S. (2007). *The Wrong House: The Architecture of Alfred Hitchcock*. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers.
- Kolker, R. (2004). The Form, Structure, and Influence of Psycho. In Robert Kolker (Ed.), *Alfred Hitchcock's Psycho: A Casebook* (206-255). Oxford, NY, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Kolker, R. (2004). Introduction to Psycho and Gaze. In Robert Kolker (Ed.), *Alfred Hitchcock's Psycho: A Casebook* (119). Oxford, NY, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Leitch, T. M. (2006). How to Steal from Hitchcock. In D. Boyd & R. Barton Palmer, (Eds.), *After Hitchcock: Influence, Imitation and Intertextuality* (251-270). Austin, USA: University of Texas Press.
- Magistrale, T. (2005). *Abject Terrors: Surveying the Modern and Postmodern Horror Film*. New York, USA: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Mulvey, L. (2004). Death Drives. In R. Allen & S. Ishii-González (Eds.), *Hitchcock: Past and Future* (243- 256). London, New York, UK, USA: Routledge.
- Oliver, K. (2008). Alfred Hitchcock: Fowl Play and the Domestication of Horror. In J. Phillips (Ed.), *Cinematic Thinking: Philosophical Approaches to the New Cinema* (11-26). Stanford, California, USA: Stanford University Press.
- Poole, J. (2008). Psycho: Queering a classic. In Morris, G. (Ed.), *Brightlights: A Queer Film Journal*. Retrieved from https://libres.uncg.edu/ir/uncg/f/J_Poole_Psycho_2008.pdf
- Rothman, W. (2012). *Hitchcock: The Murderous Gaze*. New York, USA: Suny Press.
- Sartre, J. P. (1978). *Being and Nothingness: A Phenomenological Essay on Ontology*. (H. E. Barnes, Trans.) New York, USA: Pocket Books . (Original work published 1943).
- Smith III., J. W. (2009). *The Psycho File : A Comprehensive Guide to Hitchcock's Classic Shocker*. North Carolina, USA: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.

- Sophie Fiennes (Producer), Sophie Fiennes (Director). (2006). *The Pervert's Guide to Cinema* [Motion picture]. UK, Austria, Netherlands: Amoeba Film, Kasander Film Company, Lone Star Productions, Mischief Films (Production Companies)
- Toles, G. (2004). "If Thine Eye Offend Thee . . .": Psycho and the Art of Infection. In R. Kolker (Ed.), *Alfred Hitchcock's Psycho: A Casebook* (120- 145). Oxford, NY, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Truffaut, F. (1985). *Hitchcock*. New York, London, USA, UK: Touchstone.
- Willemen, P. (1976). Voyeurism, The Look and Dwsokin. *After image* 6 (Summer 1976): 40-50.
- Wood, R. (2004). Psycho. In R. Kolker (Ed.), *Alfred Hitchcock's Psycho: A Casebook* (74-84). Oxford, NY, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Žižek, S. (1992). In His Bold Gaze My Ruin is Writ Large. In S. Žižek (Ed.), *Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Lacan (But Were Afraid to Ask Hitchcock)* (211-272). London, New York, UK, USA: Verso.
- Žižek, S. (2001). *Enjoy Your Symptom!: Jacques Lacan in Hollywood and Out*. New York, USA: Routledge.

