
Listening to Silence

The Films of Michael Haneke

Lisa Coulthard



In a film within a film segment of Michael Haneke's *Code Unknown* (*Code Inconnu*, 2000), a character being shown a soundproof room is encouraged by the real estate agent to "hear the silence." Meta-diegetically associating silence with murder (the real estate is a mere performance aimed at luring victims into a soundproof torture chamber), this film within a film acts as an interpretive kernel for the film as a whole: *Code Inconnu*, like most of Haneke's films, is about the miscommunication inherent in verbal dialogue and the weighty meaning of silence. Placed strategically within a film that opens and closes with deaf children communicating through signs and gestures, this scene encouraging the audition of silence foregrounds the relation of hearing to understanding: opening with verbally silent but actively communicating children makes explicit not only the ability to hear silence but also the imperative to listen to it.¹ Articulating the distinction between hearing and listening, the film foregrounds the ethical and philosophical dimensions of the auditory as a necessary component for fruitful communication.

For a director obsessed with the essentially and perniciously assaultive nature of interpersonal disconnection and miscommunication, the interrogation of the auditory is a pointed one. Focusing on the violence bred by non-communication, Haneke renders emphatic the impossibilities of productive, transparent and meaningful human dialogue; words tell us little in Haneke's films, in which information is most effectively, and often traumatically, conveyed through technologized, impersonal communicative vehicles (videotapes, letters, drawings) or, more brutally, through violent action and gesture. Together these failures of communication and forceful violent gestures in Haneke demand the audience's attention to the ethical implications of the auditory—an attention that I will frame here in terms of listening. French philosopher Jean-Luc Nancy notes in his recent and influential *Listening*, that the act of listening involves "an intensification and a concern, a curiosity or an anxiety," (5) that mere hearing does not. Rather than presenting a metaphor for clear understanding or even mere hearing, Nancy's focus on listening insists on the implication of the subject, on the approach to the self that is produced through the resonance of sound in the act of listening.² For Nancy, the listening subject is one in whom

1. Although the children are not completely vocally silent (since noises accompany their gestures), the basis for communication between them is non-verbal.

2. Nancy's conceptualizing of listening as resonance is linked to the work of Maine de Biran as Jacques Derrida perceptively notes in his *On Touching: Jean-Luc Nancy*. There, de Biran's analysis of the listening subject, the one who is his own echo, is quoted as follows: "The ear is as if instantaneously struck both by the direct external sound and the internal sound reproduced. These two imprints are added together in the cerebral organ, which

sound reverberates, for whom understanding is not fixed, stable and permanent but haptic, in motion and constant agitation."³

This metaphor of listening as a place of significance, of active engagement or approach to the self through resonance, is illuminated in audiovisual terms in Haneke's films through a rendering acute of ethical imperatives in acts of audition. In *The Seventh Continent* (*Der siebente Kontinent*, 1989), *Benny's Video* (1992), *71 Fragments of a Chronology of Chance* (*71 Fragmente einer Chronologie des Zufalls*, 1994), *The Piano Teacher* (*La Pianiste* 2001), *Time of the Wolf* (*Le Temps du Loup/Wolfzeit*, 2003), *Caché* (2005), *Funny Games* (1997, 2007) and *The White Ribbon* (*Das weisse Band*, 2009), a uniformity of style is readily identifiable and it is a formal identity shaped in large part by acoustic tendencies: minimal dialogue, only rare instances of music that are always in some way diegetically motivated, an intensification of Foley sounds associated with bodily movement and a massive dynamic range that shifts abruptly and violently between noise and silence.

This reshaping of the soundscape toward the resonant—to the sounds themselves rather than the meaning they carry (dialogue and music do not operate in the conventional ways that root, orient, and inform signification)—clearly works in conjunction with the openness, fragmentation, and complexity that are associated with Haneke's narratives: the ambiguous endings of *Benny's Video*, *La Pianiste*, *Le Temps du Loup*, *Caché*, and *Das weisse Band*; the segmented and multiple narratives of *71 Fragmente* and *Code Inconnu*. Fragmentary filmic structures, ambiguous

is doubly stimulated [s'électrise doublement]—both by the action which it communicates and by the action which it receives. Such is the cause of *têtes sonores* [literally, sonorous or resonant heads]" (148).

3. In some ways, Nancy's call to listen is mirrored in the therapeutically inflected idea of "deep listening." Most prominent in new age contexts of listening to one's mind in meditative states, "deep listening" has also been advocated as an approach to sound in auditory culture studies. For instance, in their introduction to *The Auditory Culture Reader*, Les Back and Michael Bull state that deep listening is to be opposed to easy listening and "involves attuning our ears to listen again to the multiple layers of meaning potentially embedded in the same sound" (3). In its emphasis on the complexity of sound and the significance of listening, this approach has some commonalities except for the very important difference that, for Nancy, the process is clearly one of ethical, epistemological, and philosophical disturbance, a fruitful agitation, rather than of enlightenment or discovery. This becomes most evident in his assertion of the resonant—active, agitated, reverberating—subject, who is in flux and motion and not tranquil or certain at all. It is also imperative that Nancy's listening is a play on the double meaning of *entendre* in French that implies understanding as well as hearing, an association that Nancy desires to break with the introduction of listening as resonance.

endings, and a loosened cause-and-effect chain mirror in each instance the failures in understanding that are essential to approaching the stories told. As the titles of some of the films rather simplistically and literally indicate, the story is unknown, hidden, or fragmented.

This fragmentation or sense of partial knowledge is perhaps most obvious in the aural minimalism that constitutes a significant part of Haneke's signature style. Paralleling this thematic fracturing of meaning are the formal, structural silences of Haneke's signature acoustically minimalistic style: the absence of non-diegetic music, the prominence of noise, the scarcity of dialogue. Moreover, when present, music and noise are not used in conventional ways, a feature that has led some to note the "fundamentally assaultive nature" of Haneke's sound (Peucker 132). For example, the elevation of outside traffic noise and the omnipresence of background sounds even in scenes of relative silence (the climactic bathroom encounter between Erika (Isabelle Huppert) and Walter (Benoît Magimel) in *La Pianiste*, for instance, is very faintly accompanied by the music from the downstairs auditorium, as is the scene of Erika breaking the glass and placing it into the student's coat pocket) do not work in a conventional manner to give the impression of an outside world or to provide atmosphere. Rather, this background noise and/or music operates abrasively, becoming distracting, burdensome, or intrusive; outside noise thus articulates not the comfort of an outside world but its absolute alienating and assaultive indifference. This is perhaps most evident in *Der siebente Kontinent*, where popular songs on the television or radio violently intrude to disturbingly score the actions depicted (the loud song playing on the radio during the family dinner scene with the brother or, most notably, the perverse presence of Jennifer Rush's "The Power of Love" that plays throughout the family's suicide scene).

In addition to its disjunctive relationship with the image, the assaultive nature of sound in Haneke has been tied to both its abrasive amplification and its pervasiveness; sound can never be offscreen as such and has the ability to move through spaces. We note this throughout Haneke's films where background sounds or sound from other rooms invade and redefine what constitutes private space; there is no such thing as aural private space in Haneke, a feature that is particularly evident in *La Pianiste* where there seems to be a constant and almost voyeuristic nature to sounds as they move through spaces intrusively and perniciously. As Jean Wyatt notes apropos of the apartment scenes in *La Pianiste*, the mother's voice penetrates everywhere and pointedly conveys "the stifling lack of space in which Erika lives and breathes" (457). The aural suffocation of the film pairs with the visual and psychological oppression to cre-

ate the impression of the uncanny maternal persistence and overbearing authoritarian presence upon which the film's articulations of sex and violence rely.

Added to these elements is Haneke's aurally disjunctive editing that cuts off sound (whether it be music, dialogue or noise) midstream or mid-note and radically contrasts acoustic tone and atmosphere between any two shots.⁴ Think, for instance, of the loud street scene following Majid's acoustically quiescent suicide in *Caché*, or the intercutting between loud music and silent credits that opens *La Pianiste*, the loud contrasts between exterior and interior shots in *Der siebente Kontinent*, or any of the abrupt and radical cuts that constitute the formal system of *71 Fragmente*. In each instance, acoustic contrasts are sharp and the cuts break off tone, harmony, or aural sustain midstream. Sound is not allowed to complete its attack-sustain-decay cycle in Haneke but is broken, severed at its attack or sustain—a rupturing that jars, assaults, and disorients the listener. We are denied the whole note or fullness of sound and are placed in a state of permanent dissatisfaction and discomfort as our aural expectations and pleasures are thwarted.

But more than the rupturing of sound, it is in the silences themselves that we find the loudest call to listen and strongest imperative to interrogate, contemplate, and resonate. As Nancy notes in *Listening*, it is in silence that we can begin to approach the self, for it is in the absence of noises, music, or voices that the subject's self can be heard: "'Silence' in fact must here be understood [*s'entendre*, heard] not as a privation but as an arrangement of resonance: a little—or even exactly...—as when in a perfect condition of silence you hear your own body resonate, your own breath, your heart and all its resounding cave" (21).

Silence is not, then, the absence of sound but its essence, and the body of the subject is its origin and endpoint. In light of Haneke's cinematic highlighting of the act of listening, it is interesting to note in Nancy's comment about the sounds of the body's cave the oblique reference to cinematic sound via that oft-cited paradigm for film—Plato's cave: "In Plato's cave, there is more than just the shadows of objects being moved about outside: there is also the echo of the voices of those who move them" (75). Not merely a shadow but an impression of images, the imaginary film screen of Plato's cave is also an echo of sounds, their resonance, and in both it operates as a metaphor for

4. In his work on Jean-Luc Godard, Alan Williams notes the prevalence of this technique in the cinema of Godard, where sonic transitions are stressed and the aural editing parallels the visually abrupt transitions. Other scholars of modernist and avant-garde cinema, such as Fred Camper and Des O'Rawe, have discussed the role of silence as a particularly effective vehicle for experimental and modernist effects.

the interior of the audiovisually defined self, a subject who is listened to as much as he or she listens. This is perhaps what Nancy is getting at when he notes that the resonant subject is not a phenomenological nor a philosophical subject, nor even a subject at all: rather this subject is “the place of resonance, of its infinite tension and rebound, the amplitude of sonorous deployment and the slightness of its simultaneous redeployment” (22). Listening, like hearing

to approximate silence with what’s called “room tone”. It’s like quiet white noise. But you can’t have zero” (1).⁶

The sound of silence, then, becomes the relative or approximate silence of background acoustic elements of space and room tone, or becomes an effect of contrast itself (a moment might seem silent when compared with a previous acoustically complex sequence), but is rarely in fact true silence.⁷ In terms of film sound, silence is relative, a con-

Silence is not, then, the absence of sound but its essence, and the body of the subject is its origin and endpoint.

itself, is an active process in time and space, that moves, resounds, and reverberates and the subject it constitutes is likewise in movement and agitation; even in silence then, there is not stasis as we auscultate our own bodies—it is corporeal movement itself that becomes amplified.

In its emphasis on the self and subjectivity, then, silence (or at least a kind of acoustic minimalism approaching silence) works to transform these aural moments into ethical ones. However, it is equally crucial to note the complexity of silence both as a philosophical and acoustic term: in film sound, silence most often implies room tone with the addition perhaps of background noise or the Foley sounds of footsteps, cloth movements, or object handling. Absolute silence, the playing of nothing on the soundtrack, is a cinematic rarity.⁵ For example, when discussing his desire to use total silence, filmmaker Mike Figgis notes that the conventions of film sound reject it: “It was something I’d wanted to do my entire film career, which is basically have *nothing* on the soundtrack. Every time I’ve tried to do that in the past, a sound person has said, ‘No, you can’t have *nothing* on a soundtrack. If you want silence, you have

constructed and fabricated *effect* of silence rather than any true entity or quality or even absence.”⁸ As Chion notes, “silence is never neutral emptiness. It is the negative of sound we’ve heard beforehand or imagined; it is the product of a contrast” (“Audio-Vision” 57).

Thus it is crucial to note that, although sound in Haneke’s films is what many auditors might mistake initially for silence, his films are in fact complex and layered acoustic creations; for instance, a scene without voice or music in Haneke is still rich with atmospheric sounds of outside traffic, the movement of bodies, the resonance of room tone, the echoes of bustling activity on roads or in buildings. In addition to these atmospheric acoustics, we can note the audible presence of life itself in Haneke through the acoustic properties of stressed corporeal movement (the sounds of moving clothes, footsteps, touching, the handling of objects, even breath). Not subtle or played low in the sound mix, these sounds of bodily movement are accentuated by Haneke, brought into the foreground. The brief close-up shots of the family’s morning routine in *Der*

5. Note, for example, that calls for quiet in the cinema—such as Adam Mars-Jones’ “Quiet, Please”—are primarily addressing music in film. And even those sound technicians and designers such as Walter Murch or Randy Thom, who note that recent cinema has become increasingly loud and that silence ought to be valued more, assert the exceptional place of true silence within the film text. Nonetheless, it is clear that silence (both relative and total) is an active subject for those who work in and theorize film sound. In addition to the seminal and influential work of Rick Altman on the non-silent nature of silent era cinema, see the essays of Chion, Figgis, Murch and Thom in *Soundscape*, as well as Gianluca Sergi’s *The Dolby Era*, and the web forum *FilmSound.org* for some indicators of contemporary interest in cinema silence.

6. Major sound designers and technicians such as Walter Murch and Randy Thom have reiterated this call for an inventive use of silence in contemporary cinema.

7. Note, for instance, an interesting exchange on *FilmSound.org*, in which a sound designer (Charles Deenan) asks “What is the sound of nothing?” and receives two replies, one of which emphasizes the idea of contrast (Mark Berger) and one that suggests the use of total silence (Randy Thom).

8. As Bela Balazs perceptively notes: “Silence [in cinema] is when the buzzing of a fly on the windowpane fills the whole room with sound and the ticking of a clock smashes time into fragments with sledgehammer blows” (207). Balazs also notes the exceptional status of cinema silence: “The presentation of silence is one of the most specific dramatic effects of the sound film. No other art can reproduce silence, neither painting nor sculpture, neither literature nor the silent film could do so” (206).

siebente Kontinent; the heavy breathing of Erika after her rape in *La Pianiste*; the rustle of clothes as Georges (Daniel Auteuil) gets ready for bed at the end of *Caché*: in each of these instances, the body becomes the centre both aurally and visually as vocality drops away and the focus tightens on the smallness of gestures and their weighty acoustic presence and significance. This concentrated reduction is achieved primarily through audio tracks that both amplify these sounds—sounds that would in any other mix likely be decreased in volume, treated as interference—and subtract those elements that would usually overpower them. For example, in *Der siebente Kontinent* we hear the acoustic details of the sounds of a polyester sock being pulled over skin and body hair with a precision and volume that makes palpable the unbearable, oppressive routine of the family. The sound itself is acoustically assaultive in its intensity, abrasiveness, and detail; it yells at us to listen closely, to accept that banal, seemingly pointless details can be heard and must be listened to. And this occurs not once but repeatedly throughout the small gestures that constitute the bulk of the film and that are replayed with similar detail throughout its duration.

This formal silence extends of course to the thematic and narrative foregrounding of the cruelty and brutality wrought by silence throughout Haneke's films. *Code Inconnu* is most overt in this via the concentrated attention to the multiple forms of and impacts of acts of silence and most concrete in the invisible yet aurally witnessed act of child abuse that occurs about halfway through the film. Anna's verbal silence in this scene, her muting of the television to hear, then her act of drowning the sound with an increase in the television's volume and her own consumption of wine, mark an ethical climax in the film. Although clearly heard, this abuse, which eventually ends in the death of the child Françoise, offers an emphatic pronouncement of the consequences of the failure to listen. As auditors to this violence, it is unclear whether we, like Anna, merely hear the crime or whether we truly listen. That is, in using all the usual acoustic indicators of point of audition sound (perspective, room tone, resonance, volume), Haneke places the focus on Anna rather than on the act itself—an emphasis that makes her ethical crisis the centre point for both the film and for us.

The ethical crisis correlated with Anna's silence pervades the text in a myriad of forms: the silences of war that may or may not be exacerbated by journalistic imaging, cultural silencing of dissonant opinions, and the painful silences of interpersonal communication within the family or couple. All of these are made concrete through the paradoxically verbally silent but thoroughly communicative deaf children who open and conclude the film. By opening

with a scene of deaf children communicating through actions, the film ties scenes of visual communication in the face of auditory interference to the heard but ignored abuse and (intimated) murder of a child (Françoise).

In his work on the voice in cinema, Chion stresses the ways in which the mute figure disturbs and reproaches: she or he acts as a kind of silent witness or moral centre—one who, as a knowing, “disturbingly limitless personage” (“Voice” 98), can provoke a sense of reproach or guilty complicity. As a visually present but emphatically silent vocal character, the mute disturbs the text in part because of his or her role as listener—a visually prominent reminder of the process of careful listening that carries with it an uncanny sense of power and hidden knowledge and disturbing reminder of our own role as auditors. In *Code Inconnu*, we see a clear illustration of this ethical centrality of the mute: pairing children who do not hear with the unseen, yet distressingly heard, “petite Françoise,” the film asserts the relation of audition to victimization, erasure and the imperative of a moral conscience. Moreover, we note the ways in which both the silent but seen and heard but invisible children in *Code* implicate us in the complicit act of secrecy: in the one instance, we are invited to share in their gestural game and in the other we are guilty of sharing in Anna's silent response to violence.⁹

In the privileged positioning of the children within the film, *Code* endows them with a kind of choral function, a thematic and ethical prominence that illustrates and complicates Chion's assertion of the moral centrality of the mute and his or her potential role as a kind of guardian of a secret. The children get the first and the last word in *Code*, and it is a word that is gestural, silent, and radically ambiguous: the first indicates fear, danger, hiding, while the last seems to imply some kind of bird in flight, movement upwards, or other utopic, metaphorically freeing gesture. In the end, we are left in the same position as the children who opened the film—guessing at the hidden meaning of the gesture, an activity that never seems to quite hit the mark. Like the silent Benny in *Le Temps du Loup* or the rejected orphan girl in *71 Fragmente*—both of whom exhibit behavioural mutism—these children in *Code* do seem to contain a secret insofar as they observe, take in, and seem to know the answers but do not enunciate their knowledge to the outside world in verbally articulated terms. However,

9. It is worth noting that many scholars have commented on the disturbing spectatorial complicity that forms a part of Haneke's style (see for instance Libby Saxton's analysis of the complicity of our gaze in the manipulation of offscreen space in *Caché*, Grossvogel's “Haneke: The Coercing of Vision” or Elizabeth Ezra and Jane Sillars's essay in the *Caché* dossier of *Screen*), but this sense of being implicated in the action is framed in exclusively visual terms.

because of the ambiguity that forms the centre of Haneke's cinema, this secret is of course called into question itself and is reduced to a kind of persistently misunderstood gesture or standing ambiguity; for Haneke, the moral secret the mute contains, then, is that there is no secret, no answer, no simple solution.

The deaf children in *Code Inconnu* thus signify the deliberate deafness of Anna (as well as other characters) as much as they do the characteristics of mutism cited by Chion. Indeed, their communicative gestures and drumming occupy a privileged space of interlocution not wit-

with regard to his use of real silence for a brief moment in his 1995 film, *Leaving Las Vegas*, it is clear that this is a point-of-audition (an acoustic analogue for point-of-view) aural effect—a suspension of sound, not its eradication—placing us in the head of Nicolas Cage who momentarily cannot hear. The images of someone running, of lips moving, of cars rushing by, all suggest the sound that ought to be there, sounds that we arguably hear on an imaginary level because of their emphatic acoustic absence. The film is not indeed silent at this moment but deaf, as we are placed in a character's aural subjectivity as he very briefly (again,

For Haneke, the moral secret the mute contains, then, is that there is no secret, no answer, no simple solution.

nessed elsewhere in the film. Similarly, the mutism found in Haneke's other films is not biological but rather tied to trauma, violence, abuse, or victimization of some form: Benny's silence after his father's murder in *Le Temps du Loup*, the orphaned child Anni in *71 Fragmente* and the failed communication attempts of Marian the Romanian boy in that same film. Even the verbally articulate son Pierrot in *Caché* can be framed in light of the morally provocative role of the mute; there is a sense that he holds the secret key to the events, that he knows something that the others (including the audience) do not—a power hinted at in his suspicion of his mother's infidelity as well as in the final scene of the film.

Taken together, these moments of silence (thematic or formal, relative or absolute) stress that one element of truly listening is to hear silence and to recognize that it is not silent at all. As I have noted, this is especially conspicuous in the case of cinema sound where filmic silence is usually used to designate an absence of foregrounded noise, vocal dialogue, or, most commonly, merely the lack of music.¹⁰ Even in those rare moments where a soundtrack drops out completely, where there is actual 'total silence,' the movement of images and even the film itself contain a certain sonorous visualization or a visual indication of an essential aural structuring absence. For instance, as Mike Figgis notes

the momentary nature of this moment as one of contrast is significant) loses hearing.

Even when total, then, silence in the cinema is never absolute: mechanical sounds, visual images that construct a hearing with our eyes and even the noises of our own bodies all carry a certain acoustic presence even in so-called total silence. Nonetheless, silence, whether diegetic, structural, or total, is a significant and potentially distressing intervention in the acoustic plenitude, lucidity, and seamless perfection we tend to associate with narrative cinema. The conventions, tropes and biases of current trends in cinema form eschew silence in any of its forms, except for those special isolated moments echoing a character's clearly demarcated subjective experience. However, as Michel Chion reminds us, the greatest potentiality for arguably the most significant technological development in contemporary cinema—Dolby sound—is the space it opens up for silence. Stressing noise reduction, Dolby opens a space for sound, one that Chion insists is there to be emptied, not just filled. At its most progressive and experimental, Dolby "makes silence deeper" ("Silence" 167), a feature that can operate to stress disjunctive contrasts, aural redistribution, and, perhaps most emphatically, the act of listening itself.

With the amplification of silence possible through the noise reduction of Dolby sound, the audience does not merely note an absence of sound, but the disturbing presence of silence itself, a feature that renders overt its function as auditors. So intense is this spectatorial sense of the duty, responsibility, and call to listening that, as Chion claims, in moments of silence it feels as if the film is listening to us: "Any silence makes us feel exposed, as if it were laying bare

10. Claudia Gorbman notes the complexity of film silence when she separates out film silence into diegetic, nondiegetic and structural silence (18-19). See also Martin Rubin's "The Voice of Silence: Sound Style in John Stahl's *Back Street*" for an example of how noisy silence can be, as well as Elisabeth Weis's *The Silent Scream—Alfred Hitchcock's Sound Track*.

our own listening, but also as if we were in the presence of a giant ear, tuned to our own slightest noises. We are no longer merely listening to the film, we are as it were being listened to by it as well" ("Silence" 151). Rendering explicit our contract to be a silent audience, the film makes us aware of ourselves, our own audio existence and resonance: it reverses our relation to the film in a way that activates those structures of listening emphasized by Nancy—duty, responsibility, activity, interrogation, and resonance.

As a point for traumatic disruption, silence can operate so that we become aware that it is the film that listens to us, that makes explicit our act of listening and that requires our own silence in response to its quiet. The moment of film silence—and here it is imperative that we are speaking of true (or at least approximately true) silence, not merely the absence of dominant music or vocal dialogue—exposes us, renders the act of listening subjective and imperative in its reflexivity and makes explicit the kind of resonant subject discussed by Nancy, the one who listens to oneself listening. This is why it is crucial to recall the impact of Haneke's title and credit sequences, cinematic moments rich with the anxieties, thoughtful contemplation, and resonance of listening to silence. Rendering us strangely complicit and demanding our attention, these moments of imposed silence are arguably a large part of what criticisms of Haneke's cruelty toward the audience rely upon: combined with the lack of conclusive endings, the eradication of the comfort, pleasure, and interpretive or emotional confirmation of response that are frequently a part of cinematic sound creates an uncomfortable viewing space where one is forced to confront one's own role as spectator and is required to respond to the film. I have framed this space of thought and freedom as an aural space, a space of listening—in short, as a space of an auditory and ethically inflected injunction to listen (to the film, to ourselves, and to ethics). Listening as resonance is not always a pleasurable activity, as it is one that requires active interrogation, a recognition of reflexivity, and a discomfiting exposure of the self. This reverberating nothingness is evident in Nancy's resonant subject who listens above all else to his or her own being, a listening that I contend is most acute in silence and in the ethical imperative that this introspective interrogation contains: in short, in those cinematic moments of total silence where the film does indeed act as a giant ear, listening to us as we listen to ourselves listening to silence. In this way, audible silence can render explicit the ethical and ontological difference between hearing and listening and can remind us of our subjectivity and of the potentially troubling sense of duty and exposure that this implies.

- Altman, Rick and Richard Abel, eds. *The Sounds of Early Cinema*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001.
- Altman, Rick. *The American Film Musical*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.
- , ed. *Sound Theory/ Sound Practice*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Balazs, Bela. *Theory of Film*. New York: Dover, 1970.
- Bull, Michael and Les Back, eds. *The Auditory Culture Reader*. Oxford: Berg, 2003.
- Camper, Fred. "Sound and Silence in Narrative and Nonnarrative Cinema." *Film Sound: Theory and Practice*. Eds. John Belton and Elisabeth Weis. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.
- Chion, Michel. *Audio-Vision: Sound on Screen*. Ed. and trans. Claudia Gorbman. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- . "The Silence of the Loudspeakers, or Why With Dolby Sound it is the Film that Listens to Us." *Soundscape: The School of Sound Lectures, 1998-2001*. Eds. Larry Sider, Diane Freeman and Jerry Sider. London: Wallflower Press, 2003. 150-54.
- . *The Voice in Cinema*. Trans. by Claudia Gorbman. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Derrida, Jacques. *On Touching: Jean-Luc Nancy*. Trans. Christine Irizarry. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2005.
- Ezra, Elizabeth and Jane Sillars. "Hidden in plain sight: bringing terror home." *Screen* 48 (2007): 215-21.
- Figgis, Mike. "Silence: The Absence of Sound." *Soundscape: The School of Sound Lectures, 1998-2001*. London: Wallflower Press, 2003. 1-14.
- FilmSound.org*. Pub. Sven Carlsson. n.d. Web. Jan. 31, 2010.
- Gorbman, Claudia. *Unheard Melodies: Narrative Film Music*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.
- Grossvogel, D.I. "Haneke: The Coercing of Vision." *Film Quarterly* 60.4 (2007): 36-43.
- Mars-Jones, Adam. "Quiet, Please." *Granta* 86: *Film Summer* (2004).
- Murch, Walter. "Touch of Silence." *Soundscape: The School of Sound Lectures, 1998-2001*. London: Wallflower Press, 2003. 83-102.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Listening*. Trans. Charlotte Mandell. New York: Fordham University Press, 2007.
- O'Rawe, Des. "The great secret: silence, cinema and modernism." *Screen* 47.4 (2006): 395-405.
- Peucker, Brigitte. *The Material Image: Art and the Real in Film*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- Rubin, Martin. "The Voice of Silence: Sound Style in John Stahl's *Back Street*." *Film Sound: Theory and Practice*. Eds. John Belton and Elisabeth Weis. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.
- Saxton, Libby. "Secrets and revelations: Off-screen space in Michael Haneke's *Caché*." *Studies in French Cinema* 7.1 (2007): 5-17.
- Sergi, Gianluca. *The Dolby Era: Film Sound and Contemporary Hollywood*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- Thom, Randy. "Designing a Movie for Sound." *Soundscape: The School of Sound Lectures, 1998-2001*. London: Wallflower Press, 2003. 121-137.
- Weis, Elisabeth. *The Silent Scream—Alfred Hitchcock's Sound Track*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1982.
- Williams, Alan. "Godard's Use of Sound." *Film Sound: Theory and Practice*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.
- Wyatt, Jean. "Jouissance and Desire in Michael Haneke's *The Piano Teacher*." *American Imago* 62.4, (2005): 453-482.