

## SUMMARY

This paper deals with the particularly significant role of vertical movements in the films of Alfred Hitchcock. Several authors have ventured to write about verticality in the Hitchcock-oeuvre but did not analyze it in its depth. Even “Hitch” himself would not speak about it in any of his numerous interviews, including the detailed Truffaut-dialogues. Hitchcock was a very conscious filmmaker: he planned every frame in advance. According to my hypothesis, such a consequent method as the frequent usage of the vertical line cannot be all accidental. In this book I attempt to find some explanation for this phenomenon.

The first chapter deals with the vertical-horizontal line in motion picture in general. Then, I briefly examine the role of verticality in the films of Sergei Eisenstein, the other great director in the history of cinema to use vertical movements with conscious frequency.

The second, longer part of this book discusses the films of Alfred Hitchcock with a special emphasis on *Psycho*. It also deals with such important films as *Vertigo*, *Spellbound*, *The Birds*, *The Man Who Knew Too Much* (second, American version), *Young and Innocent*, *Rebecca*, *The Shadow of a Doubt*, *Suspicion*, *North by Northwest*, *Rear Window*, and *Rope* but the analysis focuses on *Psycho*, as in this one film all the main problems of the Hitchcock-oeuvre appear in their clearest and most explicit form.

The detailed, frame-by-frame analysis of *Psycho* follows an inductive method: it moves from concrete, individual images all the way to general statements. This reverses the usual deductive approach of film studies, which uses concrete pictures as illustration for general theoretical statements.

This method roots from the everyday practice of my longstanding pedagogical work at the Academy of Theatre and Film. My students are filmmakers: directors, cinematographers, editors, scriptwriters, and producers. They are not deeply interested in theoretical approaches, but are rather sensitive to images: always ready to analyze the camerawork, the lighting, the acting, etc. They can better understand the complicated “montage-theory” of Eisenstein by examining the takes of Battleship Potemkin as opposed to reading and explaining the writings of the director. If I want them to understand the “inner cuts” in modern films, I will rather show them the long traveling from Antonioni’s *L’Avventura* than lecture them about the theory of André Bazin.

My paper is rather an essay than a mere analysis of a Hitchcock-masterpiece and the research of a theoretical problem. I wanted to write an enjoyable and exciting book, which – following the narrative pattern of a Hitchcock-film – provides the explanation for the mystery at the very end of the story.