

Studies on Themes and Motifs in Literature

Silence and the Silenced

Interdisciplinary Perspectives

Edited by

*Leslie Boldt, Corrado Federici,
and Ernesto Virgulti*

Contents

Introduction

vii

Part I. Silence that “Speaks” through Codes

1. Rhetorical Uses of Silence and Spaces 1
Keith Grant-Davies
2. Sounding Silence, Composing Absence of the Screen and Stage: 13
Gus Van Sant’s *Gerry* and Samuel Beckett’s *Not I*
Ariel Harrod
3. The Visiting Muse: Antiquity and the Suggestive Power 25
of Silence in the Room Frescoed by Correggio
Maria Luisa Chiusa
4. Muted Epigraphs in Kierkegaard’s *Fear and Trembling* 41
Lori Yamato

Part II. Political and Cultural Silencing

5. Cartographic Silences in Brian Friel’s *Translations* 59
Matthew Moore
6. Power of the Void: Fascism and Silence in the Poetry 67
of Bertolt Brecht and Paul Celan
Paul Peters
7. “To have him all in black”: The ‘Absence’ of Havel in 83
Samuel Beckett’s *Catastrophe*: A Late Cold War Text
Sheelagh Russell-Brown

Part III. Silencing One’s Own Voice

8. When the Silencer Is Also the Silenced: The Mechanisms 97
of Self-censorship
Magda Stoinska and Vikki Cecchetto

vi

Contents

9. Milutin Gubas’s *Which Way to the Bastille?* Or How 111
to Foster Silence
Catherine Parayre

Part IV. Fascination with the Void

10. The Image of the Falling Man Revisited 127
Sandra Singer
11. Reflections on the Violence of Art 143
Bruce Elder

Part V. Body Language

12. The A/porias of Skin: Secrets and Secretions of Self and Other 157
Mark Cauchi (with *Wrik Mead* and *Rui Pimenta*)
13. Listening to the Pines: Japanese Tea Ceremony as a Form 173
of Contemplative Ellipsis
Alexandre Avdulov
14. A Silent Language: Reflections on “Pure” and “Uncorrupted” 185
Pantomime
Elisa Segnini

Part VI. Classical and Medieval Silence

15. When a Singer Must Be Silenced 203
Anton Jansen
16. Keeping Your Mouth Shut: How To Be a Good Mistress 217
(Silenced Women in Latin Elegy)
Carol Merriam
17. Speaking Sainly Silence in the Thirteenth Century: the Case 233
of Elizabeth of Hungary
Kathleen Garay

Index

247

2.

Sounding Silence, Composing Absence on Screen and Stage:
Gus Van Sant's *Gerry* and Samuel Beckett's *Not I*

Ariel Harrod

I will begin by saying how it always astonishes me that to think and talk about sound in cinema—and I mean sound, not just voice, not just music, but all sound—was, for a long time, somewhat of a marginal concern amidst the overwhelming number of visual, narrative, aesthetic or philosophical studies that accompany the history of the medium, especially when one considers that the coupling of sound and moving image goes back to the earliest stages of its development. To Thomas Edison, for example: in 1894, in an interview for *Century Magazine*, Edison explained his intentions of coupling the Kinetoscope with the phonograph, a project that was aborted because it was deemed commercially non-viable (Masson 125). Or to the practice of the “bonimenteur,” who augmented cinematograph projections around the world at the turn of the last century by adapting the content of the films to local culture with voice, noise and music.¹ Or to the music accompanying “silent” films: not only piano playing, but also full orchestras when space and budget permitted. We find a similar historical downplaying of its fundamentally *audiovisual* nature in the case of theater. Although we recognized its seminal orality and the central relationship of text to speech and to voice, it is only more recently that we have started in-depth studies of the resounding encounter of action and space: the sonorous interaction between body and stage, mediated sound and sound design, whatever forms these might take. In this sense, even when it is speechless, voiceless, theater is never completely silent. And so, just as taking notice of sound lets us realize it has always been there, acknowledging its presence permits us to question its absence.

Of course, in an *audio-visual* art such as contemporary cinema, where sound is of the essence, there is rarely complete silence. By removing dialogue and reducing action to a minimum to eliminate audible sources you can achieve a sort of quasi silence or relative silence: the ‘silence’ of the country opposed to the noise of the city, or the ‘unbearable silence’ between interlocutors unable to speak. But if you remove all sounds, if you push the proverbial mute button, you leave a “mark of filmic enunciation” as patent as Jean-Paul Belmondo staring down the barrel of the camera in *Breathless*. Behind the curtain of sound stand big empty speakers to which our awareness is inevitably drawn because of their silence. On the other hand, when filled with sound, the speakers are immediately forgotten, raising the question: where, with respect to the image, is the sound we hear coming from?

With theater, the total absence of sound is even more problematic given the direct and unmediated presence of bodies on stage. Such a silence is thus—bar emptying the stage and cutting the lights—impossible. Of course, in making these observations, I am suddenly confronted with the problem of the ontology of silence and must ask the question: if it is no longer the absence of sound, what is silence for theater and cinema?

José Moure, in *Vers une esthétique du vide au cinéma*, is confronted with a similar problem regarding the notion of emptiness in film. In the same way that I wish to suggest there is a stronger silence in film and theater than the simple abatement of sound, he searches beyond the image of ‘absolute emptiness’: the black screen. Moure defines two possible relations between cinema and emptiness. First of all, cinema can “express emptiness” (“dire vide”). It can show emptiness and empty spaces. But it can also “produce the effect of emptiness” (“pratiquer l’effet du vide”). Therefore, “when thought of as this double value, both representative and productive, emptiness operates more like a modality of expression, like an “exhibitor” that “affects” the image or the entire film without being discernible or decomposable” (Moure 8; my translation). Moure then goes on to define three possible types of relations between cinema and emptiness: classical, spiritual and modern that each expresses a varying degree of exteriority of the image to which the emptiness can refer. Without going any deeper into Moure’s analysis, what I want to retain is this idea of a ‘productive’ value in the relation between cinema—and I would add theater—and emptiness, whether it be visual or auditory. If we consider sound as the encounter of action and space, action being the instance that provokes the mechanical wave and space being the medium in which it propagates, silence becomes a consequence of spatial relations and of bodily presence. By examining the spatial dynamics between the visible and the audible, between the corporality of figures and the space they occupy, we can better understand the poetic value of silence (or, more broadly, the expressive value of sound in audio-visual art forms). By defining the various spatial relations between sound and image, we can discover how sound circulates from one space to another, sometimes filling all zones, and sometimes leaving certain zones empty, mute, silent.

I propose to explore these spatial relations between audible and visible on screen and on stage through the examples of Gus Van Sant’s 2002 film *Gerry* and Samuel Beckett’s short play *Not I*. Referring to the work of Michel Chion, I will argue, for the former, that a progressive transfer of sound from the *visualized zone* to the *off* register effectively constructs a perceived absence of sound in the diegetic environment of the film. More specifically, I will analyze how, in the famous “sunrise sequence,” sound designer Leslie Shatz, by using weak or missed synchronisation points, composes a sound environment that actively participates in depopulating the

acoustic environment of the characters. For the latter, I will examine the progressive disconnect between the characters of Mouth and Auditor, between oral and aural. In this example, it is the staging of the failure of sound to affect the inhabited scenic environment that illustrates the effects of a perceived absence of sound. In both cases, these works enact the property of sound to circulate through the various audio-visual spatial relations.

Michel Chion proposes in *Le son au cinéma*—and expands on in *L’Audio-vision*—a tripartite spatial environment that situates sound in three possible spatial relations with the cinematographic image. These are: in, “hors-champ,” and off.² Sounds from the “in” register are essentially all sounds for which sources are visible in the frame. If you can see what is producing the sound you are hearing, it is considered “in.” This is why Chion considers the “in” register a “visualized zone.” This visualized zone is opposed to the “acousmatic zone,” acousmatic meaning: “that which we hear without seeing the sound’s original cause” or “that which lets us hear sounds without the visualizing of their causes” (Chion 63). We thus have two zones: one (the “in” zone) from which we can see the sources of the sounds we hear, and one (the acousmatic zone) from which we cannot. The acousmatic zone is then divided into two registers, “hors-champ” and off. Hors-champ (literally: out-of-field), is the space outside the frame; hors-champ sound is acousmatic sound relative to what is shown in the frame, meaning its source is invisible, but it can nevertheless be situated in the space which is that of the image. For example, the knocking on a door while what is shown in the frame is a character reacting to the sound from inside the room. Sound from the off register is sound for which the suspected source is not only absent from the image, but also non-diegetic, situated in another time or another space from that of the situation directly evoked, the most common examples being voice-over and incidental music (Chion 65). Chion depicts these three registers in a pie chart where each register borders on the other two. Of course, these borders are permeable, letting sound circulate from one register to the other as the image itself modulates. Although this characterization of spatial audio-visual relations is often insufficient to describe the complexity of numerous in-betweens—Chion concedes that it is the particularity of cinema to constantly invent new spatial audio-visual relations—it will nonetheless give anchorage for my readings of *Gerry* and *Not I*.

For those who are not familiar with the plot, the film *Gerry* accompanies two young men, Gerry and Gerry, as they stop on a drive through the desert to do a short hike to see “the thing.” Wanting to stay away from “fanny packs and single moms,” they wander off the trail. As they try to find their way back, they get lost and plunge deeper and deeper into desolation, isolation, and alienation.

The succession and opposition of two types of spatial relations structure the overall sound of the film. The bulk of the film is *sonorized* with a naturalistic soundtrack, representative of the desert in which the characters are wandering. The wind, the sand, the far-off storms modulate throughout, resonating empathetically with, or even inducing, the characters' psychological state. All these sounds are diegetical; whether "in" or "hors-champ"; loud or quiet, numerous or few, they let the spectator hear the soundscape that surrounds the protagonists. This naturalistic sound environment is intersected with long sequences where the diegetical sound is absorbed by incidental music, Avro Pärt's *Spiegel Im Spiegel* and *Für Alina*, coming from the "off" register. In these music sequences, the "in" and "hors-champ" registers are totally void, yet they do not feel completely silent. Since the sources in the image remain the same and their space is continuously actualized, the wind keeps blowing in our mind's ear; the sound persists in our awareness even if it is not ours to be heard at the moment. These two relatively stable audio-visual structures, stable because they rely on simple conventions to be decoded and understood, bring me to a third more troubled structure, exemplified in the sunrise sequence.

But before we get into this particular sequence, I should expand on the notions of synchronization and *synchresis*. As defined by Michel Chion, "in an audio-visual chain, a synchronization point is a salient moment of encounter between a sonorous moment and a visual moment." (Chion 52) As such, synchronism is not a characteristic of sound *per se*; it describes the encounter of two relative and relevant occurrences, one visual, and the other auditory. Neither is synchronism an all or nothing phenomenon; it ranges on a scale from tight ('synchronisme serré') to loose ('synchronisme large'). Tight synchronism favors a naturalistic sound environment, while loose synchronism favors a more relaxed and poetic sound environment (Chion 57). Despite this relative flexibility in temporal concordance, sound and image, when they are seemingly linked semantically, are nonetheless drawn to one another. Chion names this phenomenon *synchresis*. *Synchresis* ('la synchrèse'), a word he forges combining the words synchronism ('synchronisme') and synthesis ('synthèse'), is "the inevitable and spontaneous connection that occurs between a sonorous phenomenon and a visual phenomenon, when these two arrive at the same time, and this, regardless of any rational logic" (Chion 55). Because of *synchresis*, any visualized source can seemingly and seamlessly produce any sound: coconuts can be horse hooves; a toilet can be the *Lost Ark* of the covenant; breaking glass can be ping-pong balls. *Synchresis* "lets you sound footsteps with anything, in function of what you wish to render" (Chion 56).

I quote this reference to footsteps because they are in many ways central to the argument I want to make about the sunrise sequence. This sequence

arrives around the last quarter of the film and echoes, in its approach to sound design, a sequence at the end of the first quarter of the film, as the two Gerrys begin their hike. The sunrise sequence begins after an umpteenth night spent in the desert. The two Gerrys are slowly walking in the light of dawn. At first, only the silhouette of their two heads is visible, bobbing above the horizon. Then, as the sun slowly rises, in a single six-minute shot, their struggling bodies become more and more visible. The sound is striking in contrast with the two structures I previously described. We first hear a low rumble and footsteps in the sand. Then, above these, a glassy swell lingers and subsides. At first, because of the logic installed by a dominantly naturalistic sound design in the film so far, the low rumble passes for a stylized air tone, and the footsteps are those of the characters in the shot; both sounds are from the 'in' register. But the glassy swell complicates that reading. The source of this sound is clearly not visualized and it cannot be attributed to any source surrounding the space of the image. It resounds from the 'off' register like some element of electro-acoustic music. As the shot evolves, the sound environment is further complicated by more and more sounds, some concrete, but without evident sources, and others clearly synthetic. The 'off' register densifies, progressively outweighing the 'in.'

As this abstract sound environment takes form, the sound of the footsteps periodically disappears and reappears. Thus far, since the source of the sound is uninterruptedly present in the image, it does not feel silenced, in the same way the desert was not silenced by the Avro Pärt music. But as the bodies become clearer, the looseness of the synchronization also becomes more evident. Two opposing forces come into play. Because of *synchresis*, we desperately want to anchor the repetitive crunch we hear in the image, but eventually the persistent weakness of the synchronism severs any possible ties with the 'in' register. The crunch that was the footsteps migrates to the 'off' register. In this sequence, silence does not come from the inherent absence of sound; it is constructed through the displacement of sound. Because the 'in' register is depopulated of sound in favor of the 'off' register the diegetical sound environment is not just temporarily inaccessible, it is effectively disabled. The two characters that, throughout the film, march in almost pathological speechlessness are finally robbed of all sound as they stumble to their ultimate common resting place.

In this film, silence is not a mere acoustical phenomenon; it is a poetic figure that exacerbates the characters' plunge into nothingness. The depopulated diegetical sound environment echoes the barren wasteland in which they, the characters, walk. The silence I am attempting to describe is the product of the circulation of sound through space; it is perceived through the enacting of an audio-visual process where sound is displaced from one space to another. The three registers—in, hors-champ, off—that Chion defines are

all continually present in and around the image. Composing sound and the absence thereof involves mastering the movement of sound. Flipping the on/off switch does not create silence as a force and figure; it only transforms sound into a lingering idea. With loosely articulated temporal junctions between sound and image, and certain conventions of reception, silence can be heard as an acting force.

Chion's tripartite description of spatial audio-visual relations is not limited to a purely cinematographic application and can be equally useful in describing spatial circulation of sound in theater. As I have pointed out, extensive works studying the expressive potential of sound in theater (again not just voice, not just music, but all sound) were quit infrequent until a few decades ago. The fact that I am reflecting on such propositions now emerges in a broader context where sound reproduction and diffusion techniques have been evolving for over a century, occupying and (re)inventing various art forms (film, music, theater, radio, sound installation). These techniques and the conceptualizations of sound and space they spawned migrated from one art to another. If we can think about sound in theater in this way now, it is also because now there are sound designers in theater thinking sound for us. Rather than compose theater *in* space, sound designers like Daniel Deshays for whom microphones and headsets induce a unique understanding of reality (Deshays (a) 83) and for whom the broadcasting of sound on stage must twist and modulate our perception of time and space, are composing theater *with* space helping it move from occupation to modulation as the mode of spatial composition.

Of course the evolving conception of space in theater is not just the result of sound. In *Empty Figures on an Empty Stage*, Les Essif identifies two evolutionary traits of contemporary dramaturgy that were factors in the creation of a new theatrical "spatial language" over the last century. The first was the progressive emptying of the stage. This had the effect of minimizing the representational or referential nature of the space depicted on stage. Rather, in the barrenness of the stage, the interstices between bodies and objects became a malleable place of endless possibilities: "stage sets, as well as the objects and characters occupying the sets, were no longer supposed to recreate an exterior reality, but to suggest the possibility of an alternative, truly functional, realm where the naturalistic concern for detail would be of little concern" (Essif 20). The second was a will to represent interiority on stage. In the wake of psychoanalysis and psychodynamic theory, and influenced by the surrealists, the notion that the interior being was a space in and of itself expanded, and interior being became a space to be explored through theater and on stage. As such, it challenged theater "to exteriorize the inner life transforming into a mode of action" (Schechner in Essif 20). We recognize in this theater both a movement to project outward what is from within and,

inversely and simultaneously, a movement to circumscribe infinite worlds in the void that has become the stage. To borrow the image from Maurice Blanchot, it is as if a circle was traced around the stage into which could be inscribed the entire outside of the circle (Blanchot 112).

Of course, for Essif, Samuel Beckett participates fully in this movement. Often referred to as the author of emptiness, Beckett includes the theme early on as a narrative component in his plays: in *Malone Dies* Malone proclaims, "Nothing is more real than nothing." But this emptiness evolves into a scenographic expression (in *Godot* for example, where the country road is a non-descript, non-specific space between nowhere and nothing), finally evolving into "the multidimensional void of short pieces like *Rockaby* and *Not I*" (Essif 19). It may seem odd that I choose *Not I*, such a verbally active play, to discuss silence but, as I have already shown, *silence* implies much more than *quiet* and is beyond the mere abatement of sound. The complex spatial relations and the extremely calculated stage directions make *Not I* a deeply interesting object for the study of space, sound and sources.

I will not work with a specific staging of the play, but rather from its originally published text. In this, *Not I* presents two characters, Mouth and Auditor. Given that the relation between these two characters is central to my analysis of the play, I must point out that the importance of Auditor has often been questioned, and foremost by Beckett himself. He omitted Auditor entirely in his second production of the play with Madeleine Renaud (1978, in French). In a letter to David Hunsberger and Linda Kendal in 1986, Beckett also suggested omitting the character recognizing "he is very difficult to stage (light-position) and may well be of more harm than good. For me the play needs him but I can do without him." (Beckett in Gontarski 54) Despite the staging complications Auditor entails, the relation between Mouth and Auditor remains, as described in the original text, a strong example of what I wish to describe. One could even suggest that it is precisely this complicated spatial relation between the two characters that makes Auditor such a difficult body to stage. As the play begins, Beckett describes a stage is in almost utter darkness. Mouth blabs out a semi-coherent tale about a traumatic event from which she painfully wants to distance herself. As a preamble to this dense monologue, Beckett gives a tight set of stage directions:

Stage in darkness but for MOUTH, upstage audience right, about 8 feet above stage level, faintly lit from close-up and below, rest of face in shadow. Invisible microphone.

AUDITOR, downstage audience left, tall standing figure, sex undeterminable, enveloped from head to foot in loose black djellaba, with hood, fully faintly lit, standing on invisible podium about 4 feet high shown by attitude alone to be facing diagonally across stage intent on MOUTH, dead still throughout

but for four brief movements where indicated. See Note. As house lights down MOUTH'S voice unintelligible behind curtain. House lights out. Voice continues unintelligible behind curtain, 10 seconds. With rise of curtain ad-libbing from text as required leading when curtain fully up and attention sufficient into [...]. (216)

Beckett also gives further indications to the nature of Auditor's movements in a supplementary note regarding them specifically:

Movement: this consists in simple sideways raising of arms from sides and their falling back, in a gesture of helpless compassion. It lessens with each recurrence till scarcely perceptible at third. There is just enough pause to contain it as MOUTH recovers from vehement refusal to relinquish third person. (215)

The spatial relations between seen and heard are, at first glance, quite simple: the space represented on stage is that of the diegesis. We have a homogenous, though abstract, space where Auditor clearly hears and reacts to what Mouth is saying. In Chion's terms, Mouth's voice is coming from the "in" register, meaning its source is visible in the frame. But as the play progresses and Mouth's logorrhea continues to unfurl, two movements simultaneously operate. The first is textual: that of Mouth reaffirming with repetitive insistence the exteriorization of the action she describes ("... what?... who?... no!.. she!.." repeated 4 times before each of Auditor's movements). The second is physical: Auditor's movements lessen as he/she becomes progressively disconnected from Mouth's words. In fact, Beckett does describe a total of four movements, but the third is already 'scarcely perceptible,' suggesting that the fourth is nothing more than the idea of movement or the absence thereof. The progressive disconnect between sound and action provokes a spatial schism on the stage where sound and action are no longer able to transcend the gap. Mouth, as a stage presence, is completely (literally) disembodied; her only true agency is through the sounds she, the physical organ of speech, can produce. As those sounds cease to reach Auditor, the only body on stage, they become of another nature. The narration is no longer from the stage, but over it; Mouth's voice rings from the 'off' register, reaching us, the spectators, but leaving the character on stage unperturbed.

It has been argued that Auditor's diminishing arm movements are nothing more than a sign of his resigning incapacity to help Mouth assume the first person in the story she is telling. This is a valid and telling reading of the character, and it is not totally incompatible with the case I am making about the spatial circulation of sound and the notion of composed silence. The particular stage setting of *Not I* creates an ambiguous space with no clear

boundaries and no clear sense of where zones start and end. The only connection between Mouth and Auditor is the fact that the sound one produces solicits the other's reaction. As the sound progressively fails to do so, the spatial connection weakens. As Mouth's voice transfers from 'in' to 'off,' the third person omniscient narrator gets stronger. And as Mouth "recovers from vehement refusal to relinquish third person," the stage is progressively plunged into silence. As with the sunrise sequence in *Gerry*, this silence does not come from the absence of sound: it is a rhetorical effect constructed by the displacement of sound. Through the on-stage actualization of the transfer from 'in' to 'off,' silence is presented, not represented.

The effects that I have described in *Gerry* and *Not I* are not innately cinematographic or theatrical. The reason they span disciplines and migrate from one mode of expression to another is precisely the fact that they are not specific to a given mode of expression. Rather, they rely on a particular organization of the matters that are common to these various modes of expression. When visual space and acoustic space meet—on stage, on screen, in a gallery, etc.—these circulations can occur. Sound can be displaced from one zone to another through various mechanisms to produce varied effects, driving the narrative, affective or expressive force of a work. In *Gerry* and *Not I*, it is the enactment of a displacement of sound from the "in" to the "off" zone that generates the effect of silence. In both cases, this "silence" exacerbates the incapacity of the characters to communicate, furthering the isolation that is already expressed in other levels of the work (the photography/ scenography, the narrative, the text).

This is why I believe that there is an important distinction to be made between the way a work, a play or a film, can 'express silence' and the way it can 'produce the effect of silence' (the reader will recognize an appropriation of Moure's functions of emptiness). In an audio-visual complex, silence cannot be unilaterally equated to an absence of sound. When a mode of expression that has recourse to sound is quiet, it is only expressing silence. The absence of sound is a representation of silence in the same way the image of an empty room is a representation of emptiness. If, as it is in the material world, sound is the result of the encounter of action and space, these modes of expression truly produce the effect of silence when action no longer affects space—with the spatial disjunction between the action (of walking) and its acoustic affect (footsteps in the sand) or the spatial disjunction between a spoken voice (Mouth) and a voice heard (Auditor). Again paraphrasing Moure, it is only in these conditions that *silence becomes an "exhibitor" capable of "affecting" an entire work*. When silence is shown by means of displacement, it is no longer a suspension of discourse; it is a means of producing discourse. As Daniel Deshayes points out, "the problem with sound is it disappears when it is confronted with an image. When [conscious] listening

subsidies, all that is left is the event that associates the sound/image couple" (Deshays (b) 6; my translation) This being the problem of sound, it is also the problem of silence, and so, to fully be heard, silence must be composed in the varying relations between action and space. "L'objet sonnant, le lieu et leur relation. [...] Ces éléments sont les paramètres de la production du sonore; c'est eux qu'il faut considérer pour mettre en scène les sons" (Deshays (b) 4). The resonating object, space and the relation between the two: these are the parameters of sound production; it is these that must be considered in the staging of silence.

Notes

¹ On this subject, see: Germain Lacasse, *Le Bonimenteur de vues animées. Le Cinéma "muet" entre tradition et modernité* (Québec/Paris: Nota Bene/ Méridiens Klincksieck, 2000).

² In her 1994 translation of Chion's book, *Audio-Vision, Sound on Screen* (Columbia University Press), Claudia Gorbman uses the terms 'onscreen' ('in'), 'offscreen' ('hors-champ') and 'nondiegetic' ('off'). Although these terms are closer to those commonly used in English to describe visual space in film, they seem to me to betray the lexical opposition that Chion establishes between diegetical sources (in) and nondiegetical sources (off) and to overemphasize an opposition between visible sources (onscreen) and non-visible sources (offscreen) within the diegesis. Since the core of my argument is fueled by the terms initially coined by Chion, and in English no less, I will conserve them for this discussion. Therefore, all quotes from Chion are in my translation using the original French text.

Works Cited

- Beckett, Samuel. *Collected Short Plays of Samuel Beckett*. London: Faber and Faber, 1984.
- Blanchot, Maurice. *L'entretien infini*. Paris: Gallimard, 1969.
- Chion, Michel. *L'audio-vision*. Paris: Nathan, 1990.
- Deshays, Daniel (a). *Pour une écriture du son*. Paris: Klincksieck, 2006.
- . (b), Master Class Given on February 15th 2010 at the University of Montreal, transcribed by Anne-Marie Leclerc, edited by Frédéric Dallaire [http://www.creationsonore.ca/docs/ateliers/atelier_daniel_deshays.pdf], viewed on April 29th, 2012.
- Essif, Les. *Empty Figure on an Empty Stage: The Theater of Samuel Beckett and His Generation*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2001.

Gontarski, S. E. "Revising Himself: Performance as Text in Samuel Beckett's Theater," *Journal of Modern Literature* 22, No. 1 (Autumn, 1998): 131–45.

Lacasse, Germain. *Le Bonimenteur de vues animées. Le Cinéma « muet » entre tradition et modernité*. Québec/Paris: Nota Bene/Méridiens Klincksieck, 2000.

Masson, Alain. *L'Image à la parole, l'avènement du cinéma parlant*. Paris: La Différence, 1989.

Moure, José. *Vers une esthétique du vide au cinéma*. Paris/Montréal: L'Harmattan, 1997.