

NICK REDFERN

“Leading them Down the Garden Path:” Another Look at Hitchcock’s *Psycho*

Introduction

Having subjected the audience to one of the most harrowing experiences in the history of the cinema, Alfred Hitchcock promises to solve the mysteries of *Psycho* (1960) through the authority of the psychiatrist, Dr. Richmond. As Sheriff Chambers states with total belief, “If anyone gets any answers it’ll be the psychiatrist...” However, Dr. Richmond’s explanation of Norman Bates’ psychosis is fundamentally flawed: he is unable to come to terms with the contradictory nature of Norman. In answer to Lila Crane’s question, “Did he kill my sister?” Dr. Richmond's reply is, “Yes... And, no.” At every turn Norman confounds the assembled characters at the police station as they try to understand him, the evidence standing in open contradiction to the explanation offered by the psychiatrist. For example, Norman is a man who, in order to complete his sexual identity, dresses in the clothes of a woman but, according to Dr. Richmond, he is *not* a transvestite.

This yes/no aspect of *Psycho* can be seen to be manipulated by Hitchcock throughout the film in an effort to deny the spectator any basis for comprehending the quite literally senseless violence of the film. Here the director aims to perplex, to

confuse, to offer an explanation and completely debunk it, to begin making one film and finish making another. This is a mischievous Hitchcock who presents us with an interesting question: How do we, the audience, cope with Norman Bates? The scene in the police station mirrors the many attempts made by film critics to analyse *Psycho* in terms of psychoanalysis, and like Dr. Richmond they are unable to offer any satisfactory explanation that is compatible with the evidence within the film. In this essay I wish to explore some of the ways in which Hitchcock disturbs our understanding of *Psycho* through mismatching elements of character, dialogue and *mise-en-scene* in order to undermine Sigmund Freud's theories on anal-compulsive behaviour and castration, and then to show how with the removal of generic logic, and the use of techniques developed for television, the director's devious sense of humour runs riot.

Anal-Compulsive Behaviour

In his book *The Films of Alfred Hitchcock*, David Sterritt suggests that *Psycho* demonstrates the director's preoccupation with anal-compulsive behaviour.¹

Hitchcock stated, in his interviews with François Truffaut, his desire to make a film beginning with the arrival of food into a city and ending with the sewers, thereby viewing society as a process of digestion and defecation.² Although this single statement appears to be the extent of Hitchcock's "preoccupation" there does appear to be some evidence to support Sterritt's thesis and his starting point, taken from Freud's *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, would seem to be very promising. Freud states that in obsessional neurosis,

regression of the libido to the antecedent stage of the sadistic-anal organisation is the most conspicuous factor and determines the form taken by the symptoms. The impulse to love must then mask itself under the sadistic impulse. The obsessive thought, "I should like to

murder you,” means... nothing else but “I should like to enjoy love of you.”³

Although Robin Wood criticises Dr. Richmond’s explanation as being “glib” and “[ignoring] as much as it explains,” he follows Freud’s outline exactly in seeing, along with Raymond Bellour, the shower sequence as a “symbolic rape”⁴ and Sterrit points to further evidence to support this view of Norman. For example, as Marion Crane and Norman take supper in the motel parlour Norman sits in a position to suggest that he is defecating. Immediately prior to this scene “mother” has chastised her son with references to the process of digestion: “Go on, go tell her she’ll not be appeasing her ugly appetite with my food or my son. Or do I have to tell her because you don’t have the guts? Huh, boy? Do you have the guts, boy?” This dialogue clearly shows that Norman is, in his “mother’s” eyes, still a boy and makes specific reference to his “guts.” Barbara Creed makes the point that Mrs. Bates is still “toilet training her son, that is, teaching him about the clean and unclean areas of the body and mind.”⁵ This image of Norman is reinforced as Lila explores his childish bedroom. She discovers a gramophone recording of Beethoven’s Eroica Symphony: a circular (anus-like) disc with a circular label and a circular hole. The title itself, Sterrit points out, contains an anus-like “O” (Er-O-ica) and is only one letter short of “erotica.”

This represents the limit of the evidence for a sadistic-anal Norman. There is a good deal more on this theme but it serves to complicate what appears to be a clear-cut case. If we look again at the dialogue above we see that only part of it is associated with Norman (the reference to his guts). The “ugly appetite” for food and sex belongs to Marion. Indeed, the first line of dialogue in the film refers to Marion’s appetite, when Sam comments on the uneaten food in the hotel room: “Never did eat your lunch did you?” We are without doubt that the couple has been having sex and the implication is that Marion’s sexual appetite and her metabolic appetite are one and

the same. The link between Marion and anal-compulsive behaviour is much stronger than that with Norman. The several shots of bathrooms in *Psycho* occur when Marion is present: at the Phoenix hotel, at Marion's house, at the car dealership, and at the Bates Motel. Only the latter of these may be associated with Norman. The licence plate of Marion's car reads ANL-709, only a single letter away from "anal" and again the anus-like "O" is present, but as Marion trades this car in for another prior to reaching the motel it has no link to Norman. In the motel parlour it is noticeable that Marion's position mirrors that of Norman: if he is defecating then so is she.

Furthermore, in this sequence it is Marion who eats, which Sterrit reminds us is the first stage in the process of alimentary digestion. Norman does not eat the sandwiches nor drink the milk. Sterrit also points to the money as being tied to the anal-compulsive elements of the film. For example, he cites the businessman, Cassidy, as treating money like shit when he comments on Marion's robbery, "She just sat there while I dumped it out." It must be acknowledged that the only character to show no interest in money is Norman. He is not even aware of its existence whereas every other character is motivated by the pursuit of the \$40,000. Hitchcock removes the value of an argument such as Sterrit's at the same time that he suggests it, through the contradictions of *mise-en-scene* and character.

Sterrit's argument falls between the cracks in the film created by the rupture of Marion's murder. An overall view of *Psycho* is difficult to present as it is divided by the spectacle of death into two almost exclusive sections. A recent article by Laura Mulvey, in which she takes such an overall view and identifies Freud's ideas on the death drive as an organising principle, is deeply unsatisfying.⁶ As a "master plot" the death drive is an attempt to return to an earlier state of things, to the inorganic, and ultimately to death. This is linked by Mulvey to the end of narrative, but as it is

Marion who is compelled to return to stasis the metonymy between her death and narrative death does not exist. Mulvey herself acknowledges this when she states, “In *Psycho*, the spectacle of death is detached from the film’s end.” However, this does not prevent her pursuing the link between human end and narrative end, and later stating that “narrative end and human end literally coalesce.”⁷ Clearly these statements are contradictory, and the latter is also factually incorrect. As Hitchcock does not close the narrative with the death of the villain but ruptures the narrative less than half way through the film with the end of Marion, does this argument have any relevance to the overall film? Most obviously Norman has no relationship to the death-drive argument as it applies to Marion, just as he has no relationship to the money in the film or to Marion’s first car. Similarly Marion’s story is divorced from what Mulvey describes as “the film’s actual secret,”⁸ the discovery of the corpse in the cellar. Of all the critiques of *Psycho* discussed here this piece is the most original and stimulating, and with its starting point in Douglas Gordon’s *24-Hour Psycho* offers the potential for a new and intriguing analysis. However, Mulvey’s psychoanalytic account fails to connect the two elements of what many have identified as the hybrid plot structure of *Psycho* producing an account as incomplete as that of Dr. Richmond. This raises the question as to whether psychoanalysis is an appropriate tool for opening up the film.

Castrator and Castrated

The oedipal theme in *Psycho* is strongly pushed forward by Hitchcock whilst he also makes use of a contradiction present in Freud’s own analysis to undermine it. Hitchcock makes a point of affirming the oedipal scenario described by Freud. In stating that “a son is a poor substitute for a lover,” Norman implies that a son is a

substitute for a lover nonetheless. It also seems logical to assume that it was Norman who murdered his mother's lover, and that as a result of this act he was incarcerated in "some place," that is, a "madhouse." In *Norman Bates* we ought to be able to point to a textbook example of the oedipal scenario. But it is not this typical outcome that Norman aspires to, and although we can identify a positive we must also face up to the fact that we are provided with a negative. "Mother" is presented as the castrating influence of the film that induces Norman's psychosis. Norman's desire to compensate for his mother's lack is not motivated by love, but by fear. It is the fear of castration that Norman can only overcome by becoming the castrator, that is, his mother. However, in Freudian psychoanalysis it is the father who is the castrating influence within the family. Freud did possess clinical evidence that some children see the mother as the castrator (for example, the case of "Little Hans"⁹) and yet he insisted that this was the role of the father. The absence of Norman's father, about whom we know nothing, should lead in an oedipal scenario to the son replacing the father, whom he sees as an idealised figure who possesses the phallus, and not an attempt to become the mother who is conditioned by lack.

Language, one of the fundamental aspects of psychoanalysis, is also reversed: the son, the male, the active, is unable to compete verbally with the supposedly passive mother, and, as we shall see, Hitchcock continually reverses notions of activity and passivity. In general Norman cannot successfully partake of conversation; notably, he is unable to say "bathroom" and Marion must complete the sentence for him. When confronted by Sam Loomis, Norman is nervous at his persistent questioning, as he was with the questions of the detective. Bellour has noted that Sam and Norman are of similar appearance and we might speculate that Norman in this scene is confronted by an older version of himself, namely his father. The castrator

here is represented as male, notably the male who compensates for Marion's lack, and, possibly, a father figure. Just as Norman is castrated by his mother's tongue he is unable to speak before Sam. This stands in contradiction to the image of the castrating mother to which we have become accustomed by this point in the narrative. When faced with an argument such as that of Barbara Creed, which stresses the castrating influence of the mother, it should be remembered that Sam is the only character to restrain Norman. As Lila confronts "mother" in the basement it is Sam who has power over both Norman and "mother," neither of whom can compete with his physical strength. The dominant and castrating male is thus reintroduced to the predominantly female world of the film, and Norman, who has now "become" his mother, is handed over to the police, the most powerful symbol of patriarchal order.

Central to psychoanalytic critiques of Norman is the active/male-passive/female division of labour described by Laura Mulvey.¹⁰ This again is derived from Freud:

Contrast between masculine and feminine plays no part as yet; instead of it there is the contrast between active and passive... That which in this period seems masculine to us, regarded from the standpoint of the genital phase, proves to be the expression of mastery, which easily passes over into cruelty. Impulses with a passive aim are connected with the erotogenic zone of the rectal orifice, at this period very important; the impulses of skoptophilia and curiosity are powerfully active.¹¹

If Norman is to be seen as a child whose progression is limited to the anal phase then he must be regarded as passive. And yet the most explicit act of voyeurism in the film places Norman as the bearer of the look, as the active agent. Examples of the active/male look are few and far between in *Psycho*, with the infamous shower scene dominating critiques of Hitchcock's work. Beyond Norman's gaze, which corresponds directly to Mulvey's economy of the gaze and the cruel impulses Freudian psychoanalysis associates with "active skoptophilia," we find that only one other male character is able to assume a similar role. The male who searches for

Marion, who represents the symbolic order and the law, is the detective, Arbogast. Like Scottie in *Vertigo* (1958), Arbogast possesses an “active sadistic voyeurism” as a detective who “looks” for Marion and then will punish her for committing the theft.¹² The importance of the look of authority figures, namely the agencies of the law, reveals itself at the close of the film when the police and the camera see “mother” through the screen-shaped window.

Psycho does not limit itself to the active/male look. We see, for example, many shots through the *windscreen* of Marion’s car. Her view of the world through this screen corresponds exactly to the spectator’s experience of the diegetic world of *Psycho* on the cinema screen. Most strikingly, in the shower sequence there is no direct male viewpoint. The killer is seen from Marion’s position, and “mother” sees Marion. Our investigative surrogate who actively takes on the detective search, who reveals the truth to us and through whose eyes we see, is Lila. The discovery of the body in the cellar, the aim of all suspense fiction, has no male agency and we see through the eyes of Lila and the corpse of mother (whose look persists beyond the grave). It is also Lila who demands that Norman be punished for his transgressions, betraying the sadistic impulses she shares with Arbogast.

Psycho treats the male look and the female look as equal. In the opening scene Sam and Marion discuss “seeing” each other. Sam is assigned the power of the male look when he asks if he can “see” Marion in the future. Hitchcock then demonstrates Marion’s ability to look when she quickly replies, “We can see each other.” In the police officer that follows Marion we again find the “active sadistic voyeurism” that has proved so enduring in psychoanalysing *Psycho*. However, on this occasion it is contrasted with Marion’s point of view. Here we have an example of the voyeur seeing and being seen by Marion, who is our surrogate within the diegetic world. This

stands in direct contradiction to all that psychoanalytic theories of spectatorship tell us about the nature of voyeurism. As Mulvey points out, not only is the woman not the bearer of the look but the man cannot bear the burden of being the object gazed upon,¹³ and devoid of all character the police officer in his uniform and sunglasses presents a purely fetishised figure. Another excellent example of this shared look is when Marion sees her employer after she has stolen the money. We see this scene from two positions, each corresponding directly to the point-of-view of the characters. The two possible alternatives provided by Freud's work negate each other. Furthermore, if we consider the voyeuristic elements of the film we find a second contradiction between the *mise-en-scene* and the action.

In Barbara Creed's analysis, all the aspects of this contradiction are present.¹⁴ Taking careful note of Hitchcock's ingenious use of *mise-en-scene*, Creed makes the point of establishing the diegetic world of *Psycho* as predominantly female. It is difficult to deny such obvious effects and this demonstrates the strength of the director's vision. Repeatedly the eye and the look are associated with the female. *Psycho* opens with the camera moving through a motel window making voyeurs of us all. The scene inside is of two lovers, Marion and Sam, talking after an afternoon's illicit love-making. The most important element of this conversation concerns a future, more respectable meeting at Marion's house with her sister present and her mother's picture on the mantle. This first introduces us to the idea of the female gaze as Sam asks, "And after the steak do we send sister to the movies, turn Mamma's picture to the wall?" In this single statement Hitchcock reveals all his plans for *Psycho*. We find reference to appetites, explicitly metabolic and implicitly sexual, and shared equally by both male and female. We also encounter the female look of the cinematic spectator (which prefigures Lila's subsequent role as detective), a fact

repeatedly overlooked by those who rush to the final element of this sentence, the castrating mother. The maternal gaze is set up as censoring, castrating, the active, and it is this gaze that Norman comes to fear. The *mise-en-scene* is created around an image of the female and,

once we become aware of the prevalence of the image of woman as castrator in the horror film, we can more easily recognise the signs of her presence—cruel appraising eyes, knives, water, blood, the “haunted” house... The house, domain of the mother, looms up behind the motel as if trying to see the activities that take place below, in the motel, a place associated with impersonal casual sex.¹⁵

Creed also acknowledges the association between birds of prey, harpies, women and the camera. In the parlour scene the stuffed birds, through the visual elements of the film, are created as representative of this female look and posed in terrifying positions. Their active, voyeuristic power is that we have already come to understand as being associated with the mother. However, this is juxtaposed with the sound track to undermine our assumptions based on the *mise-en-scene*. Norman refers to the birds as passive. This is the reason he prefers to stuff them as opposed to creatures such as foxes or chimps that are “not passive to start with.” It is significant then that Norman also stuffs his mother. The passive Norman is subject to the active female gaze and her surrogates. However, Norman also possesses an active power over the birds and his mother and this contradiction cannot be sublimated into the active/male-passive/female economy we expect to find. Having attributed to Norman the passive elements of the film Creed then goes on to state that “as soon as Marion returns to her room we learn that Norman is a peeping tom, a voyeur... Norman’s eye is filmed in extreme close-up, drawing attention to the act of voyeurism... Now Norman controls the look.”¹⁶ As I have already stated, such a simplistic description of the look is inappropriate with regard to *Psycho*. Psychoanalysis cannot reconcile these conflicting looks as it tends towards a reductive viewpoint: man as castrator and

voyeur. This view is both reinforced and denied by Hitchcock's handling of the organisation of the film.

In an earlier piece Raymond Bellour used the parlour scene to demonstrate his division of *Psycho* into male psychosis and female neurosis. It is in this scene, he states, that Hitchcock "places face to face, fictitiously, two psychic structures: man and woman, the latter destined to become the prey of the former."¹⁷ As I have already stated such an economy is complicated through Hitchcock's mismatching of the film's elements. Certainly Marion as his victim is prey to Norman, but we can also go further than this to place Norman on the side of prey. The birds in the parlour are prey to Norman as he captures, kills, and stuffs them. Norman's mother also fulfils this role. However, as has already been stated these birds, with their association with the feminine, have a power over Norman. The owl that dominates the parlour scenes is itself a bird of prey holding Norman in its maternal gaze. Marion is also associated with these birds to which Norman is prey through her name (Crane) and the observation that she "eats like a bird." As Marion stands to leave the parlour she towers over Norman and through a high shot Hitchcock places her gaze in the same region as that of the owl. To summarise, Marion, "mother," and the birds are prey to Norman; but Norman is prey to this same trinity. For Bellour's argument this poses the question as to where the fields of psychosis and neurosis lie, as both male and female are capable of functioning in the same role. This contradiction is expressed by Bellour himself when he states that Marion "has to be a bird" but "cannot really be a bird" without adequate explanation. The attempt to segue out of this problem by reducing it to an issue of "appetite" is, like Sterrit's, nullified by Bellour's own observation that during the parlour scene Norman does not eat.¹⁸

As is apparent from the above comments, the acts of looking and being seen are crucial to psychoanalytic accounts of *Psycho*. This is particularly true of Slavoj Žižek's paper on Hitchcock that derives its title from Racine's *Phaedre*: "in his bold gaze my ruin is writ large." This line, Žižek states, could well serve "as an appropriate epithet to Hitchcock's universe," where the gaze encountered "is not a seen gaze, but a gaze imagined by me in the field of the Other." Suspense, it is argued, is not produced by a "simple physical confrontation between subject and assailant, but always involves the mediation of what the subject reads in the other's gaze."¹⁹ This argument is, I believe, flawed in three ways. First, it continues the binary relationship of subject-assailant that is problematic in Mulvey's description of the active-passive, or in Bellour's duo of predator-prey. Norman assaults Marion but is himself the object of the assaulting gaze of the birds and also the horror genre's "standard" other, the woman. Second, suspense in *Psycho* is quite literally dependent upon a number of "simple physical confrontations." For example, the confrontations between Marion and her employer, and Marion and the policeman, propel the theft story that forms the first third of the film. Even the meeting between Marion and the car salesman takes on a menacing air when he announces he is "in no mood for trouble" when the spectator knows what he does not: that Marion is on the run. As Lila searches the house, the director creates a level of suspense through confronting Norman with Sam, and as we have come to identify with Norman since Marion's death we fear what truth might be revealed. That truth is revealed in the physical confrontation between Lila and the corpse of Mrs. Bates.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the complex network of looking, present in *Psycho*, is not something hidden, something obscured that needs to be imagined. Far from it, much of the complication in analysing *Psycho* is created by

Hitchcock's delight in ostentatiously displaying an excess of looks. The list of characters that look and are seen comprises almost the entire *dramatis personae*, and includes Marion, Sam, Lila, Norman, Marion's employer, the policeman, Arbogast, Dr. Richmond, and "mother." In the opening scene of the film even Marion's mother is assigned the power of the gaze. The inanimate also gazes, as we see in the Bates house, the stuffed birds, and the corpse of Mrs. Bates. The supposed simplicity of psychoanalytical accounts of this intricate web is of little use when confronted with such a level of excess. Žižek takes his title from Hippolytus who in mistaking Phaedre's gaze brings about her downfall. Through Hitchcock's organisation of *mise-en-scene*, his use of dialogue, and the exchange of looks he removes the possibility of simply comprehending the relationships contained within the film, tricking the psychoanalysts into falling over their own arguments. As Creed, Sterritt, and Bellour find themselves misconstruing the evidence before them one might say that in Hitchcock's bold gaze lies the ruin of Freud and Lacan.

Conclusion

The director's television showcase, *Alfred Hitchcock Presents*, is famous not for its narratives nor its action but for the appearance of Hitchcock as master of ceremonies, arriving on screen to the "Funeral March for a Marionette" to deliver his droll introductions and conclusions to the half-an-hour's entertainment sandwiched therein. With *Psycho* we see a similar type of introduction in the famous trailer in which the director revealed all the sets and almost the entire plot. What we fail to realise as spectators, and this is borne out in so many critiques of the film, is that we are being set up for a fall. In drawing attention to the picture that covers Norman's spy-hole (a representation of "Susannah and the Elders") Hitchcock forces us into seeing this

scene in terms of male voyeurism. Having created such a narrative image, Hitchcock then trashes the expectations we have formed on information that he himself has released. What first appears to be a foolhardy act, that is, giving away the plot of the film in the trailer, is really a prelude to the biggest practical joke in cinema history. Listening to the text of trailer once we have seen the film reveals just how much the director is laughing at us. For example, we have his description of “mother:” “She was the weirdest and the most... well, let’s go into her bedroom. Here’s the woman’s room, *still beautifully preserved...*” The subtlety of this humour is overwhelming and such effects are typical of Hitchcock, especially in his television work where a single line of dialogue or a final action could transform a narrative into something wholly unexpected in the final reel. The Norman/“mother” scenario is such a “Hitchcock” moment, but one that goes beyond the “MacGuffin” (an object or secret, irrelevant in itself, but on which the whole narrative turns) and stands out as a blatant practical joke.

Can we believe that any director, and especially one so universally respected as Hitchcock, would invest so much effort in a practical joke? Even if we bear in mind the director’s famously macabre sense of humour it seems a little difficult to swallow that an entire film would be conceived in such a manner. It is, however, possible to see in *The Birds* (1963) another example of Hitchcock’s perverse humour at work. With the follow-up to *Psycho*, Hitchcock conspired with screenwriter Evan Hunter to lull the audience into a false sense of security by beginning the film as a romantic comedy only to transform the narrative into sheer terror:

Once we got them laughing, we would be leading them down the garden path. And once the early comic scenes turned frightening, then whenever there was a lull between bird attacks, we could hope for a sort of nervous laughter that would lead to further screaming even if we photographed an innocent feather duster.²⁰

For example, the early comic scene in the pet shop sees Melanie Daniels chasing two escaped lovebirds having flirted with Mitch Brenner. The emphasis here is on comedy. This is turned on its head in the second half of the film, when the idea of the birds on the loose leaves the spectator terrified. From the lovebirds in the cage we move to Mitch and Melanie, our two new lovebirds, imprisoned in their own home.

Psycho offers a whole realm of delights to the Freudian observer but the theory behind Norman does not match the evidence. What is actually contained within the film does not tally with what we expect to find. Norman is both a killer and not a killer. Norman is both anally compulsive and he is not. The woman is both castrator and castrated, as is Norman. In this way Hitchcock is able to generate a level of uncertainty within the spectator by deliberately using our *a priori* knowledge of Freud and the cinema: first to offer one easily accepted solution and then to undermine it. The Freudian analysis of cinema is, in a very disturbing manner, the true subject of *Psycho*. Correspondingly, Freudian analysts are the subjects of Hitchcock's black humour as he pokes fun at the audience, and the simplistic Freudianism of Dr. Richmond is revealed as inadequate.

Notes

1. David Sterritt, *The Films of Alfred Hitchcock* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 100-107.
2. François Truffaut, *Hitchcock* (London: Palladin, 1986), 304.
3. Sigmund Freud, *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis* (New York: Permabooks, 1953), 352-353.
4. Raymond Bellour, "Psychosis, neurosis, perversion," *Camera Obscura* 3/4 (1979). Reprinted in Marshall Deutelbaum and Leland Poague, eds., *A Hitchcock Reader* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1986), 311-331; Robin Wood, *Hitchcock's Films* (South Brunswick, N.J.: A.S. Barnes, 1977).
5. Barbara Creed, *The Monstrous-Feminine: Film, Feminism and Psychoanalysis* (London: Routledge, 1993), 142.

6. Laura Mulvey, "Death Drives: Hitchcock's Psycho," *Film Studies* 2 (2000), 5-14.
7. Mulvey, "Death Drives," 9-10.
8. Mulvey, "Death Drives," 12.
9. Sigmund Freud, "Analysis of a phobia of a five year old boy," in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 10, trans. James Strachey (London: Hogarth, 1953-66), 1-50. See also Creed's re-analysis of this case that forms the basis for interpretation of Psycho as a narrative of the castrating mother, 88-104.
10. Laura Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," *Screen*, 16.3 (1975). Reprinted in Leo Baudry and Marshall Cohen, eds., *Film Theory and Criticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 833-844.
11. Freud, *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, 336. See also Mulvey, 'Visual Pleasure,' 835.
12. Mulvey, "Visual pleasure," 842.
13. Mulvey, "Visual pleasure," 837-838.
14. Creed, 139-150.
15. Creed, 140; 145.
16. Creed, 145.
17. Bellour, 319-320.
18. Bellour, 320.
19. Slavoj Zizek, " 'In his bold gaze my ruin is writ large,' " in Slavoj Zizek, ed., *Everything you always wanted to know about Lacan (but were afraid to ask Hitchcock)* (London: Verso, 1992), 214.
20. Evan Hunter, "Me and Hitch," *Sight and Sound*, 7.6 (1997), 28.