

Please note this is a pre-print copy of Cenciarelli, Carlo, 'The Possibilities of Cinematic Listening — An Introduction', in Carlo Cenciarelli (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cinematic Listening* (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190853617.013.1> It is posted in this institutional repository in keeping with OUP's Author reuse and self-archiving policy. Please cite from the printed version.

The Possibilities of Cinematic Listening: An Introduction

Carlo Cenciarelli

In the thirty-first-century interstellar worlds of the animated TV series *Futurama* (1999–2013), the protagonist—Philip J. Fry, a cryogenically-preserved pizza delivery guy from the late-twentieth century—comes into possession of a thirtieth-century musical instrument called the Holophonor. The instrument looks like a mix between a clarinet, a rattle toy, and a Turkish Shisha, and—unsurprisingly—it is rather difficult to master. Our defrosted protagonist can only play the instrument thanks to alien parasites and Faustian pacts with the Robot Devil, but the results make it all worth it. The Holophonor produces musical moments of fantastical effect. Lights and smoke appear, and the music triggers holographic images, spectacular visions ranging from the abstract to the figurative.

Fry uses the instrument to declare his love to *Futurama*'s main female character—the one-eyed, purple-haired Turanga Leela. His first Holophonor song is an audiovisual fantasy in which the two prospective lovers dance across time and space before exploding into stardust. The animation, tightly synchronized with music, has something of the associative and anthropomorphic nature of Disney's *Fantasia* (1940); the music is an orchestral pastiche with echoes of Tchaikovsky's symphonic waltzes, Danny Elfman's music for Tim Burton's

gothic comedies, and the celesta arpeggios of a Harry Potter theme. Leela is charmed (Figure 0.1).¹

[PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 0.1 ABOUT HERE]

The Holophonor puts a literal spin on the notion of music’s evocative powers, or—to use Simon Shaw-Miller’s phrase—it plays with an understanding of music as “a special category of enculturated sighted sound.”² More specifically, it seems to give a material (if imaginary) shape to the process of “cinematic listening,” at least in the definition given by Michael Long.³ Through a number of virtuosic intertextual analyses, Long argues that cinema has shaped our musical imaginations by contributing to the creation of a widely shared audiovisual vocabulary, an expressive vernacular whereby “aural gestures can trigger the construction or recall of particular image registers and the reverse.”⁴ While the precise Holophonor mechanism is unknown, the instrument’s fusion of familiar orchestral sounds with romantic imagery suggests the possibility of it “registering” the kinds of audiovisual associations discussed by Long: music can literally be turned “on the fly into visual images”⁵ and the listener’s imagination can be “played” through sound.

By relying on a mechanical transducer that can turn sonic inputs into visual representations, Fry’s holophonic performances take to extremes the processes of “musical acculturation” described by Long and Shaw-Miller and—before them—by Michel Chion, Simon Frith, and Peter Franklin. Drawing on Michel Chion’s theorization of the pervasiveness of cinema’s sonic conventions, Frith puts forward the deceptively simple claim that “cinema is a school of listening.” “Film music has taught us how to see,” he writes, “while film images have taught us how to hear.”⁶ Franklin has likewise traced music’s ability to “summon a world of imagined cinematic experience” back to the proto-cinematic

narratives of nineteenth-century music.⁷ Evoking Faustian myths and the phantasmagoria of magic lanterns, channelling Disney while being broadcast on Fox TV, and tapping into the promises of holography, the Holophonor acts as a reminder that, if “cinema” has something to do with the codification of our audiovisual vernacular, then its workings need to be studied in relation to multiple layers of media history.

A strange assemblage of sounds, technologies, discourses, and listening practices, *Futurama*'s imaginary machine thus lays bare some of the stakes and complexities of this volume's object of study. In a basic sense, I would argue that studying cinematic listening means trying to understand what makes the Holophonor possible or—more precisely—what makes cinematic listening possible in the absence of a Holophonor. It means finding ways to qualify, theorize, historicize, problematize, and defamiliarize the hypothesis that cinema has taught us how to hear, unpicking the discourses, experiences, and technologies that bridge cinematic and aural cultures, past, present, and imagined, thus working towards a better understanding of the place of cinema in the history of listening.

Thus, the study of “cinematic listening” entails a dual focus. First, it requires studying how *listening to film* is situated in specific textual, spatial, and historical practices. Did film bring about new ways of hearing, and how did listening practices change during the early years of cinema? How is listening framed by specific venues and presentational strategies? In what ways and to what extent can films shape their own aural reception, and does a “new cinema of the senses” involve new ways of experiencing sound? Second, the study of cinematic listening involves exploring what it means to *listen cinematically*: the ways in which modes of listening to film may have extended beyond the texts, places, and institutions of the cinema. To what extent do cinematic conventions shape our understanding of sounds and images outside the cinema? How does listening to film compare to the forms of aural attention and engagement afforded by interactive media? Does the cross-fertilization of

screen genres lead to hybrid modes of listening? Does cinema provide a model for other forms of collective listening? Is the “soundtrack of everyday life” just a hackneyed expression or does it suggest a blurring of the boundaries between the virtual and the real?

In pursuing these lines of enquiry, this volume builds on a complex network of scholarly developments. Questions of listening have underpinned the study of film sound since the foundational work of scholars such as Claudia Gorbman and Anahid Kassabian, Chion and Nicholas Cook, Rick Altman and James Lastra, who laid the groundwork for understanding film sound in relation to suturing and identification, multimedial semiosis and cognitive schemas, sonic ecologies and the history of technology.⁸ In recent years, with the emergence of sound studies and a humanities-wide “sensory turn,” the issue of how we listen to film is starting to be addressed more directly,⁹ and—even when the focus is not explicitly on listening—the rapid expansion of scholarship in all areas of audiovisual studies from pre-cinema to new media is contributing to a better understanding of the role of sound in the cinematic experience and of the relationship between the “local” and “global” economies of film sound,¹⁰ be it through the study of performance practice, commercial synergies, or film sound technology and sound design.¹¹

Exploring the place of cinema in the history of listening entails connecting between these areas of film sound research, and also forging new links with film phenomenology, cinema history, audience studies, and media archaeology. Indeed, while the starting point for the study of “cinematic listening” has been music, and while musicology remains an important perspective, the guiding hypotheses of this volume are that cinema not only has a profound effect on the way music is talked about, used, and experienced, but also on our understanding of what constitutes music and what counts as listening. And that, in turn, film sound extends beyond film, has the power to shape the way we make sense of the world around us, and is responsible for changing notions of the cinematic.

Accordingly, in introducing this volume's central topic, I try to problematize its definition, and to map out some of its constituent questions. In the first half of this introduction, I make a case for the importance of studying cinematic listening in spite, or—rather—precisely because, of the term's elusiveness and of the methodological challenges it poses. In the second half, I provide an overview of the volume content, discussing how each section contributes to our understanding of the archaeologies, aesthetics, and extensions of cinematic listening. I conclude by connecting some of the ideas that cut across sections, sketching out the picture of cinematic listening that emerges from this volume, with a particular focus on the feedback loop between *listening to film* and *listening cinematically*.

The Cinema Effect

To the extent that it engages with the idea that cinema has shaped the way we listen, the study of cinematic listening contributes to the broader, thorny discussion of cinema's "'invisible hand' in our affective life and our modes of being-in-the-world," or—as Thomas Elsaesser calls it—the "cinema effect."¹² The interest in how music can evoke cinematic narratives in our "inner eye"¹³ is essentially a musicological counterpart of Elsaesser's argument that "key elements of cinematic perception have become internalized as our modes of cognition and embodied experience," and that, as he puts it, "there is no longer an outside to the inside: we are always already 'in' the cinema with whatever we can say 'about' it!"¹⁴

As Elsaesser's exclamation mark signals, trying to account for this "effect"—whether cinema's effect on listening or the role of sound in the "cinema effect"—takes us into a perilous scholarly terrain marked by dangerous generalizations and long-standing anxieties about cinema as a technology of sensory training.¹⁵ Indeed, while the cinema has not received yet much attention in histories of music listening, when film's contribution has been addressed, it has often been portrayed as reifying the Romantic link between music and

subjectivity—an idea conveniently summed up by Leon Botstein’s argument that “the silent film era may then be regarded as the last phase of an historical evolution in listening,” because sound film brought to an end the time “when listening to music appeared highly individualized, when each listener was able to make a connection in the hearing of music rooted in personal experience.”¹⁶

Botstein’s quote is emblematic of well-established fears about cinema’s colonization of the listener’s imagination.¹⁷ His diagnosis resonates with Adorno’s (and Eisler’s) famous analysis of the pseudo-individualism of film and its damaging effects on musical listening, yet Adorno’s take on film is part of a broader critique of the cultural industry that does not equate the ideological workings of bourgeois culture with any particular technological development. Conversely, in Botstein’s version, the listening imagination before sound film is presented as ideologically neutral, with the suggestion that listeners, untainted by cinema, were freely and routinely engaging in wonderful reveries that appropriately performed the music’s imaginative affordances, notions that both Adorno’s cultural critique and James Johnson’s historical work have complicated.¹⁸ This familiar teleological narrative also seems to assume that the relationship between music and film is fully consumed by the codification of film’s audiovisual language, with no space left for the imagination, whether through supplementary visualizations taking place during the film or through further “imaginings” after the film has ended.

The study of cinematic listening has the potential and the responsibility to critique and enrich this narrative. It can challenge the particular forms of imagination that are valorized within the discourse of musicology and it can explore the effects of cinema’s vernacular imaginary, engaging with the way film contributes to what Elena del Rio calls a “rigidification of the language and experience of emotion”¹⁹ while also tracing some of the possible imaginative pathways that cinema opens up, both in front of and in the absence of a

screen. In the process, it can expand our conception of the relationship between cinema and experience, addressing urgent questions of pervasive mediation while also engaging with phenomenological and philosophical approaches that theorise the cinematic experience neither as an illusion nor as an intrusion, but rather as an “*extension*” of the viewer’s embodied experience of the world.²⁰

The complexities of the cinema effect are not limited to its ideological implications. Alongside a question of whether cinematic listening is good or bad for you, Elsaesser’s suggestion that “there is no longer an outside to the inside” of cinema also raises fundamental methodological issues. If cinema has become internalized and embodied so that we are indeed already “inside it” with whatever we can say “about it,” then is discussion about “cinematic listening” intrinsically tautological? In other words, how *cinematic* is cinematic listening? And is it really about *listening* anyway?

The “Cinematicity” of Cinematic Listening

At once invoking and dispensing with a notion of medium specificity, the “cinematic” is a term that is both problematic and productive when it comes to studying listening. The question of specificity has acquired particular urgency in view of convergent modes of production, distribution, and exhibition brought about by the so-called “digital turn.” In addition to fueling a rich debate on the loss of an indexical relationship with reality, cinema’s progressive turn to digital has renewed discussion about where the distinctive qualities of “film” may now reside, whether in its materiality, in formal properties, in a canon of artworks, in modes of production, or in gate-keeping institutions. And are such qualities dependent on the experiential conditions of theatrical exhibition or can they be “relocated” to smaller platforms?²¹ Logically, this debate has clearly gone hand in hand with a re-thinking of the mutating ontologies and modes of spectatorship of early cinema.²²

For the study of cinematic listening, one of the most important outcomes of the burgeoning debate on film's early years and on its digital transformations is a greater awareness of the sense in which—as Elsaesser has argued—analytical definitions of cinema's ontology (“what is cinema”) should give way to non-teleological, archaeological analyses of particular processes of ontologization (“when and where is cinema”).²³ Just as changes in film sound practices can be a way of exploring cinema as something that is constantly in “emergence,”²⁴ an analysis of cinema's processes of ontologization can be a way of exploring the emergence of different modes of cinematic listening. That is to say, we should replace the question “*what* is cinematic listening” with questions such as “*when* is listening cinematic” and “*where* is listening cinematic,” jettisoning a search for essential qualities in favor of studies of how different understandings of listening *as* cinematic can and have emerged at particular times and in particular conditions.

An important corollary to this is that cinema, and thus ideas of what constitutes cinematic sound, are constantly being renegotiated “off-site,” through the production, marketing, consumption, and public discussion of artefacts that do not claim to be “cinema.” In their study of *Cinematicity in Media History*, Jeffrey Geiger and Karin Littau emphasize that the term should not be seen as indicating a “quality intrinsic or *proper* to cinema” but rather as “a descriptor of how the cinematic can operate at more ephemeral and mobile levels.” Indeed, for them the cinematic is located in “precisely those art forms and systems of representation . . . that are not cinema *per se*,”²⁵ such as video games and gaming cultures.²⁶ This puts a particular spin on the debate about cinema's seeming loss of a central place in today's mediascape. If we agree with commentators such as Steven Shaviro that cinema in the twenty-first century has abandoned its place as a cultural dominant and has accrued a “residual” status,²⁷ then the resilience of the term “cinematic” (something that is arguably manifest in Shaviro's own decision to call the new regime of digital media “post-*cinematic*”),

might be seen to suggest that cinema, rather than losing significance, is assuming something of a gaseous form, evaporating into an adjectival status that is constantly absorbed and transformed through other media engagements. In less vaporous terms, this is Lev Manovich's idea of cinema as "a cultural interface,"²⁸ but one that—more like a neural network—is constantly redefined by the encounter with new data.

On the one hand, then, it is important to work against the vagaries of the "cinematic," providing rich descriptions of what counts as cinema within specific cinematic sites. On the other, the very vagueness of the term—its seeming ability to be everything and nothing at once—deserves consideration. In a discipline-defining intuition, Anahid Kassabian has called attention to the ubiquity of music in contemporary life, exploring its relationship with pervasive media technologies.²⁹ While for Kassabian interest in these forms of ubiquitous listening should eventually displace film music from the "center of the scholarly worldview,"³⁰ we might alternatively ask in what ways, and to what extent, ubiquitous music continues to carry traces of the cinematic. Do musical protocols from film provide invisible interfaces for interacting with other media? Does sound contribute to the mobility of the cinematic?

The "Aurality" of Cinematic Listening

And what kind of *traces* might cinematic listening leave behind?³¹ In their introduction to *The Oxford Handbook of Music Listening in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, Christian Thorau and Hansjakob Ziemer note that historians often have to read and interpret sources for what they "*imply* about listening."³² The problem of traces applies to the internalized nature of listening—and not just music listening—past and present. Observational and experimental methodologies can provide an additional set of powerful tools for the scholar of

contemporary culture, but of course they come with their own epistemological limitations, particularly concerning the interpretation of complex data and issues of ecological validity.³³

Studying listening in the context of cinema is twice as tortuous, as it requires interpreting sources and data that—for the nature of the apparatus, grammar, marketing, and writing conventions of film—tend to sideline the role of sound in the experienced event. In this volume, approaching these challenges from a humanities perspective, we look for evidence of actual and intended listening practices in illustrations and photographs, in debates in the trade press and technical instructions issued to projectionists and consumers, in the look of cinema interiors, in interviews with engineers and filmgoers, in industry audience surveys and court hearings, in large online questionnaires and small-scale experiments, in observed behavior inside the cinema theatre and in classroom debates, in patterns of vocal performance, in representational tropes and phenomenological structures, in the changing uses of pre-existing music and Foley sounds, and in ancillary materials and remediations.

Not only does bringing listening into focus require various kinds of labor—archival, analytical, technical, observational, experimental, interpretative, rhetorical, and theoretical—but this labor seems part and parcel of listening’s recently found status as a particularly prized object of study. For Sander van Maas, the elusiveness of listening is central to its growing theoretical and cultural appeal. Van Maas forges a link between the growing value assigned to listening and a re-thinking of what *counts* as listening, thus productively connecting a question of traces (the elusiveness of listening) to one of boundaries (what listening is). As he puts it, “listening emerges when it appears to end up or to run up against thresholds and limits,” “such as speaking, reading, touching, sensing or hearing.”³⁴ The more we look for listening traces, the more its sensory specificity seems to dissipate, and with it also goes the theoretical separation between listening (as act of focused, deliberate attention)

and hearing (as a pre-cognitive impression).³⁵ Which is to say, not only is listening always on the verge of turning into something else, but is it ever just *listening* in the first place?

Persuasive arguments have been made in favor of replacing the monosensory term “listening” with the more holistic category of “musical experience.”³⁶ In this volume, we preserve the term “listening” precisely because, in combination with its “cinematic” modifier, it can serve to tease out the (still relatively overlooked) specific contribution of the aural to the broader cinematic experience while also drawing attention to the fact that the aural is always entangled in the multisensory nature of that experience.³⁷ In other words, if—as Nicholas Cook has influentially argued—musical multimedia can provide a model for rethinking musical meaning as emergent and contextual, then cinematic listening can call attention to how listening, too, is “never alone.”³⁸ Cinematic listening, that is, might highlight the uniqueness and cultural specificity of “modernist listening” as a “mode of listening predicated on pre-existing meaning defined through sensory reduction.”³⁹

Issues of multi- and cross-sensoriality take us back full circle to the “cinema effect,” because the question of how cinema engages our senses is also implicitly a question of agency. Studying listening in the context of embodied spectatorship can be a way of developing classic theorizations of the viewer as “passive, vicarious, or projective,” *and* also of rescuing a more active role for them.⁴⁰ On the one hand, building on Gorbman’s foundational theorization of film music’s ability to “render the individual an untroublesome viewing subject,”⁴¹ we can explore how new media and a new cinema of the senses use sound to capitalize on the vulnerability of the spectator’s body for aesthetic, commercial, and political purposes. On the other, we can identify the ways in which sound requires active engagement both inside and outside the cinema space, promoting forms of socialized spectatorship and turning cinematic reception into more outward-directed actions that have a different set of aesthetic, commercial, and political implications.⁴² In this sense, rethinking

the epistemology and ontology of listening from the perspective of the cinematic also involves rethinking the nature of listening as an action, and can play into a broader recognition of listening as a performative act.⁴³

Mapping Cinematic Listening: Archaeologies, Aesthetics, and Extensions

In view of what we have outlined so far, this volume takes “cinematic listening” and its constituent terms as emergent concepts. In order to explore how changing notions of “listening” and of the “cinematic” have shaped each other, we look at the archaeologies, aesthetics, and extensions of cinema’s aural practices. We situate listening to film in specific venues, texts, and filmgoing habits, while also trying to illuminate cinema’s dynamic relationship with other representational models, industrial practices, and forms of live and electronic entertainment. We consider how ancillary objects use sound to prepare and prolong the cinematic experience, while also discussing how other media—in the process of mobilizing the protocols of cinematic sound—appropriate and redefine ideas of the cinematic.

Archaeologies (traces and places)

Part I and Part II find material and discursive traces of cinematic listening in a range of cultural sites, contributing to an archaeological (i.e. multi-layered and discontinuous) understanding of cinema’s aural practices. Part I (“Genealogies and Beginnings”) explores the genealogies of cinematic listening without searching for a continuous lineage or univocal origins,⁴⁴ focusing on how cinema presented and reconfigured the relationship between sound and visualization found in earlier and contemporaneous forms of public entertainment. In the opening chapter, cutting across four temporal layers, Peter Franklin discusses forms of musical seeing cultivated in nineteenth-century popular theatre, Wagnerian operas, post-

Wagnerian opera, and late twentieth-century opera films. Engaging with the argument that cinema might reify or obstruct earlier (more personal and more sensitively imagined) realizations of music's visual potential, Franklin suggests that—in “fully realizing” operatic forms of musical seeing—cinema might actually reveal opera's own fraught (and often suppressed) relationship with mass entertainment. In Chapter 2, zooming into one particular form of middlebrow entertainment popular at the time when moving-image technologies were being developed, Emilio Sala turns to the sonic practices of the *Chat Noir* (1885 to 1889). Through detailed philological work, Sala argues that specific kinds of musics, in combination with different forms of verbal address, were intended to promote a range of modes of spectatorial engagement, and links these heterogeneous forms of shadow entertainment to similarly heterogeneous configurations of distraction, absorption, and contemplation found in early cinema. In Chapter 3, Jacob Smith encourages us to listen more closely to early phonograph musicals. In an archaeological vein, and focusing on a well-defined corpus of records produced between 1905 and 1911, Smith highlights a potential but interrupted line of descent from phonographs to sound films, where the vocal types and representational tropes of these early records not only anticipate the heteronormative numbers of later Hollywood musicals but also indicate substantial changes in attitudes to ethnicity and courtship.

Whereas Franklin, Sala, and Smith consider sound film in light of pre-existing practices, the last two chapters in the section focus on changes in listening at critical junctures in the early history of film. In Chapter 4, Julie Brown focuses on musical “trick films” by Georges Méliès and Segundo de Chomón as an example of how early cinema playfully engaged with the idea of visualizing inaudible diegetic music. Brown places trick films in a dialogue with new audio technologies of the time, showing how these indirect, multimodal constructions of audibility reversed the way in which the telegraph, the

theatrophone, the telephone, and the phonograph unwittingly suppressed (and implied) music's visual source. In the section's concluding chapter, Jim Buhler focuses on the transition to the talkies. By means of analysing trade journals and early audience reactions, Buhler shows how recorded synchronised sound was seen as incompatible with an existing paradigm of the "cinematic" based on live music, and thus how conceptions of the cinematic were being negotiated in relation to concertgoing and the sonic conventions of live theatre. What's more, he shows that this new conception of cinematic sound—and particularly the use of synchronized voices and sound effects—was deemed by some notable commentators to require a shift between incompatible ways of listening, dispelling the reverie of early "silent" cinema.

Part II ("Locations and Relocations") explores how listening to film is framed by specific presentational practices, venues, and technologies, with particular attention paid to the relationship between live and recorded elements. These are aspects that have received increasing attention across the humanities over the last two decades, as scholars have turned more systematically to the idea of cinema as an event, to the material conditions of spectatorship, to the affective significance of musical performance, to the value of liveness, and to the study of architectural acoustics and sound technology.

In Chapter 6, Ben Winters focuses on roadshow exhibition practices, and particularly on the way overture, entr'acte, and exit music, in careful coordination with lighting and curtain operations, was used to frame and punctuate these deluxe screenings. Winters argues that these musical paratexts presented a range of practical and aesthetic orientations towards the cinematic experience by means of calling patrons back to their seats, showcasing the theatre's sound technology, and also inflecting the ontology, structure, effects, and connotations of specific films. In Chapter 7, turning to another practice with distinctive cultural status, Jocelyn Szczepaniak-Gillece focuses on the exhibition of European films in

American art houses between the late 1950s and the early 1960s. Combining a Foucauldian approach to discipline with a New Cinema History attention to the material histories of spectatorship, Szczepaniak-Gillece discusses the particular labour of viewing and listening that American viewers were required to perform in return for social distinction.

Chapter 8 keeps the focus on the 1960s and on filmgoing behaviour, but considers the use of cinemas as venues for live music. Simon Frith explores the phenomenon in relation to the development of British rock music and offers a novel perspective on the topic of synergies between film and music industries. Drawing on press reports, newspaper clippings, concertgoers' memories, and photographic evidence of audience behaviour, Frith discusses the ways in which the cinema—also thanks to popular rock 'n' roll movies—became a place “where young people learnt how mass youth culture should be performed.” In Chapter 9, Jeremy Barham tackles the in some ways complementary phenomenon of relocating the cinematic experience to a concert hall, with a live orchestra. Barham suggests that the phenomenon of live-score screenings, while seemingly unproblematic for audiences who have embraced the product without apparent misgivings for its hybrid mixture of real-time and pre-recorded events, in fact has far reaching philosophical implications, complicating the idea of a unified subject position and blurring divisions between story world and real world.

In the section's closing chapter, Meredith Ward turns a critical ear to Dolby Atmos' contribution to the rich history of surround sound. Combining a historiographical approach with first-hand interviews with Atmos engineers, Ward explores a mismatch between Dolby's PR messages and the technology's actual use. She considers how Atmos' particular ability to engender a sense of spatial presence was in turn applied to the mixing and remixing of music, with the transmedia platform used to position listeners inside the mix, sometimes literally inviting them to walk through a space designed by sound.

Aesthetics (texts and bodies)

In Parts III and IV, the emphasis shifts to the aesthetic specificity of films as complex experiential objects. Part III (“Representations and Re-presentations”) focuses on film as a system of representation and as a site for the remediation of previous musical presentations. Involving close readings, hermeneutics, and the changing cultural meanings of works and musical traditions, the study of representations has been a natural research area for music scholars, and a significant way in which film-musicology has engaged (more or less explicitly) with the question of how cinema can shape the way we attend to music, inflecting our understanding of its aesthetics and ontologies.⁴⁵ One particular thread running through this section pertains to how the representation of listening turns a largely internal, mental operation into visible actions and reactions, in a process of externalisation that reflects (at the level of representation) the broader methodological challenges raised by the opacity of listening. Chapters in Part III scrutinise this opacity through careful analysis but also reflect upon the methodological limitations of textual hermeneutics.

The section starts with two chapters that explore the idea of sound as representational surplus. In Chapter 11 on Chantal Akerman’s *La Captive* (2000), Richard Dyer establishes a parallel between the film’s male character’s obsessive desire to probe the mind of the captive female, and the cinematic listener’s normative desire to press sounds for their significance. He thus argues that the film—by asking its spectators to interrogate their own interrogation of sound—stages “a lethal and gendered epistemology of the ear” that deserves to be theorised alongside film studies’ familiar concept of the male gaze. If for Dyer sound’s refusal to yield to meaning is part of a distinct aesthetic and formal strategy, for David Code in Chapter 12, it is an opportunity to rethink the very usefulness of “narrative” as a theoretical frame. Code uses moments of “seeing hearing” and “hearing hearing” in Stanley Kubrick’s films to argue for a more nuanced approach to the interplay of mimesis and diegesis in film, drawing

attention to how cinema—*vis à vis* the literary models on which its stories are often based—shapes our modes of listening and viewing through light, colour, sound, and acting.

As with Dyer's and Code's chapters, Julie Hubbert's analysis in Chapter 13 of Terrence Malick's *Badlands* (1973) approaches listening from an authorial perspective. Hubbert positions Malick as a particular kind of countercultural listener, and argues that we should hear *Badlands*' unusual musical and formal features—such as the mix of pre-existing popular and classical music and the suppression of diegetic sounds—in light of the changing listening practices of the countercultural youth and of their multiple (and sometimes contradictory) investments in experimentation, audiophilia, and eclecticism.

In Chapter 14, continuing an exploration of the cinematic re-presentation of pre-existing music, Guido Heldt draws attention to the overlooked topic of “listening” in biopics of “classical” composers, a blind spot that reflects—in a microcosm—musicology's historical tendency to privilege compositional process and performance practice over the study of listening. Heldt provides a taxonomy of listeners, of their motivations for listening, of the meanings they hear in the music, and of the ways in which—by exteriorizing these meanings—filmmakers cast musical features in particular biographical trajectories. Whereas Heldt gives us an overview of listening as a narrative trope across a large number of examples, in Chapter 15 Jonathan Godsall turns to the cinematic appropriation of one specific musical material—the finale of Rossini's *William Tell*—in one particular media franchise, the *Lone Ranger*. Godsall places the music's latest cinematic adaptation (2013) in the long history of the finale's affiliation with the franchise, showing how a mode of listening that he calls “the blockbuster cinematic” emerged out of previous radiophonic and televisual iterations and then shaped the music's further re-uses as “post-existing music.”

The section ends with Martin Barker, who takes issues in Chapter 16 with the theoretical and interpretive orientation of film music studies and calls for more empirically-

grounded accounts of the role of sound in cinematic representations. Writing from the perspective of audience research, and drawing on a vast database of responses collected through an international online project on *The Lord of the Rings*, Barker encourages us to test our hypotheses about diegesis, immersion, and identification against audience responses, but also argues that theorizing from the ground up will likely change the questions we ask ourselves as scholars, and puts forward a list of suggestions for the better integration of textual and empirical methodologies.

Part IV (“The Listening Body”) continues the previous section’s exploration of the formal properties of specific films, but shifts emphasis from textual organisation to a theorisation of how sound engages the full body sensorium. While work on film phenomenology, haptic viewing, and affect has typically underplayed the importance of sound, contributions in this section show the extent to which these frameworks can be used to enrich our understanding of the embodied nature of cinematic listening and of the role of sound in a new “cinema of the senses.”

In Chapter 17, drawing on Chion’s notion of “corporeal covibrations,” Lisa Coulthard explores cinema’s sensory impact through the paradox of the cinematic punch, where our bodies vibrate to the sound of physical contact that has *not* taken place on screen. Tracing the history of the punch from the standardized “John Wayne chin sock” to the individualized sound objects of contemporary cinema, Coulthard explores how these hyper-brief audiovisual gestures rely on our corporeal memories and at the same time mobilize the embodied knowledge of previous *cinematic* experiences. Whereas Coulthard focuses on short moments of sonic impact, in Chapter 18 Danijela Kulezic-Wilson looks at the workings of soundtracks that need *time* to seduce their viewers. In this sense, Coulthard’s and Kulezic-Wilson’s chapters can be seen to develop two contrasting aspects of Laura Marks’ theorization of the haptic as involving a way of “making oneself vulnerable to the image.”⁴⁶ In particular,

Kulezic-Wilson extends (and sonifies) Marks' idea of the cinematic experience as an erotic tension between the bodies of viewer and film, where a discerning spectator enters in a "consensual" relationship with the body of film. She argues that this aural erotics depends on the musicalization of all elements of the soundtrack, a process that she couches in a broader history of twentieth-century listening from John Cage to the World Soundscape Project and up to recent practices of "integrated" sound design.

The next two chapters focus on the soundtracks of science fiction cinema. Similarly to Kulezic-Wilson, in Chapter 19 John Richardson, Anna-Elena Pääkkölä, and Sanna Qvick argue that music helps bridge, experientially, the gap between screen and spectator. However, their specific focus is on post-minimalist musical idioms and on how the soundtracks of *Interstellar* (Hans Zimmer) and *Arrival* (Jóhann Jóhannsson) provide opportunities for spectators to experience alien conceptions of time and space and to glimpse otherworldly solutions to political conflicts and ecological crises. The utopian dimension of cinematic listening teased out by Richardson et al. is reversed in Miguel Mera's analysis of sci-fi and the cinema of the senses in Chapter 20. Drawing on the history and philosophy of surveillance, Mera traces a cinematic trajectory where the body is progressively (more intensely, and more invasively) colonized by technology, and shows how cinema's ability to engage the spectator's senses—accompanied by film theory's own gradual awakening to the haptic nature of sound—is related, in unsettling ways, to increasingly complex and totalizing surveillant assemblages.

Whereas Mera's chapter explores a dystopian fusion of sensory modalities, in Chapter 21 Holly Rogers focuses on what is at stake in moments of audiovisual dissonance. Rogers identifies two types of soundscape composition—"sonic elongation" and "sonic aporia"—that, by stretching the relationship between hearing and vision, forestall traditional modes of cinematic listening and also trouble assumptions of coherence and morphological wholeness

implied by some theories of embodied spectatorship. In this sense, if Kulezic-Wilson and Richardson et al. consider how cross-modal fusion can lead to new forms of embodied knowledge, Mera and Rogers show that cross-modal fusion can compromise the ability of a distinct sense to act as a potential site of resistance.

In the last chapter of Part IV, moving beyond the aesthetics of specific films and anticipating topics explored in Part V, James Deaville inspects the “listening body” from the perspective of the “trailer ear,” a listening orientation that revolves around the expectation of extreme loudness. Drawing on audiology accounts, medical guidelines, instructions for projectionist, audience surveys, and proposed legislation, Deaville describes the issue of cinematic loudness as a physiological, psychophysiological, and discursive matter, showing how the trailer becomes a site of contestation where issues of passivity have concrete implications for the spectators’ well-being.

Extensions (beyond film and between media)

The two concluding sections focus more explicitly on how ideas of cinematic sound extend beyond the confines of cinema as a text, site, or event. Part V (“Listening Again”) explores a range of ways in which film sound is encountered (and reinterpreted) outside the cinema, through ancillary materials, in pedagogical contexts, in experimental conditions, and in everyday media experiences.

In Chapter 23, Jeff Smith offers a novel perspective on the cross-promotion of cinema and popular music. Drawing on empirical and theoretical studies on aesthetic fluency, Smith argues that we should consider the commercial and aesthetic synergy between film and pop in terms of the ease of processing audiovisual stimuli. Looking at release dates, pop charts, and album sales of films from *Saturday Night Fever* (1977) to *The Guardians of the Galaxy Vol.2* (2017), Smith suggests that the marketing and formal strategies of music in film are

underpinned by considerations about habituation, exposure, and hedonic peaks, providing an important example of how findings from the psychology of perception can inform the study of audiovisual aesthetics.

In Chapter 24 Paul N. Reinsch then zooms into the little discussed case of what he calls the “unified soundtrack album,” a hybrid of music, dialogue, and sound effects, and an intriguing example of the commercial extension of a movie’s sonic footprint. Focusing specifically on Queen’s music for *Flash Gordon* (1980), Reinsch argues that unified soundtrack albums—in spite of their sonic heterogeneity—can present listeners with a version of the film that is aesthetically more coherent in that it bypasses some of the artificiality of cinema’s audiovisual synchronization.

In Chapter 25, Katie Young approaches cinema’s ancillary musical materials from a contrasting cultural and methodological perspective. Through ethnographic research carried out in Northern Ghana, Young shows that, in post-colonial Africa, Hindi film songs have provided an important and resilient link between filmgoing and religious education. First, she finds evidence of a number of ways in which religious and linguistic schooling have shaped how audiences listened to Hindi film and how they behaved and still behave in cinema halls. Then she studies how these Hindi film songs have entered and shaped pedagogical practices in Northern Ghana, offering a striking example of the feedback loop between listening cultures inside and outside the cinema. One of the rare studies of cinematic listening outside Europe and North America, Young’s chapter also throws into relief some of the practices of disciplined silence that have become naturalized in Western contexts.

Chapter 26 keeps the focus on pedagogy and—engaging with non-American cinema in an American educational context—it theorizes the act of teaching film and film soundtracks as a practice of introspection and a way of listening to one another with greater care. Positioning herself as the cinematic listener, Elsie Walker offers a personal and

autobiographical account that is generalizable precisely because of its irreducible specificity, and calls for a scholarly practice that should include the listener's evolving sense of self and the private circumstances that give film sound its constantly changing meaning.

Chapter 27 approaches the question of hearing “again” from the perspective of cognitive psychology. Janet Bourne suggests that the kind of associational listening described by the musicological work on cinematic listening can be explained by combining topic theory with a cognitive framework of analogy. Through the close study of a well-defined corpus of films and through statistical analysis of free associations produced in a listening experiment, Bourne's chapter provides additional evidence of the “cinema effect” on music listening, thus corroborating some of the indirect findings of previous studies and sketching out a methodological template for the empirical testing of cinematic listening.

In the section's closing chapter, Randolph Jordan focuses on a piece of non-cinematic footage that indelibly marked the start of the twenty-first-century: the sight of the first plane crashing into the World Trade Center, and the accompanying, asynchronous sound of its impact. Jordan explores that sonic delay against cinematic expectations for audiovisual synchronicity. He argues that the “breaking” of cinematic conventions was central to the epistemological value of the footage and to the dramatic power of its many subsequent iterations, and was tied into a broader rethinking of the performative nature of documentary filmmaking in an era of 24/7 remediation.

With its transmedia focus, Jordan's chapter also provides a link with the volume's concluding section. Part VI (“Between Media”) considers the relationship between the protocols, textual patterns, audio-visual strategies, and phenomenological structures of cinema and those of TV series and music video, promenade theatre and personal stereos, video games and VR technologies. In Chapter 29, Robynn Stilwell turns her attention to “binge-watching,” a phenomenon that has been discussed as “cinematic” in the sense of

involving high production values and a carefully crafted, long-range dramatic trajectory that can be enjoyed in one fell swoop. Focusing on the truncated show *Invasion*, originally intended to be shown weekly on ABC, Stilwell explores a potential mismatch between the TV series' complex narrative and its original mode of consumption, arguing that the score, in particular, because of its contribution to intricate plot lines, affords and rewards the kind of attention associated with binge-watching protocols.

Chapters 30 and 31 turn to a comparative study of film and music video. Focusing on David Lynch and Michael Gondry as two examples of “transmedia directors”⁴⁷ and offering a new take on Chion’s listening modes, Mathias Bonde Kosgaard suggests that music videos and cinema share an ability to engender forms of “reduced viewing” where music can encourage an engagement with the material qualities of the image. If Bonde Kosgaard focuses on the way music, both in videos and in film, can musicalize vision, Laurel Westrup calls attention to how music videos—through the integration of non-musical sounds—can invite us to listen to songs cinematically. In particular, Westrup focuses on a class of music videos that feature layered sound designs, and shows how the careful integration of music, dialogue, and sound effects is used to evoke broader narrative frameworks that can suture in the viewer or also create a gap by positioning the song at an ironic distance.

The next two chapters explore the “cinematicity” of mobile listening. In Chapter 32, Ya-Feng Mon discusses *Remote X*, an example of headphone-based participatory performance that has toured across the globe and that makes many claims on the cinematic. Focusing on a particular instantiation of *Remote X* in Taipei in 2017, Mon explores a friction between the artists’ claims and the show’s actual reception. She identifies the reason for this tension in conflicting understandings of what it means to have a cinematic experience, and argues that *Remote Taipei* can be seen as emblematic of a dialectic between global strategies of technological mediation and the specificity of local reception. In Chapter 33, complicating

the notion that cinema and personal stereos are about invisibility and social withdrawal, Carlo Cenciarelli explores a range of ways in which mainstream cinema—because of its representational tropes and modes of spectatorial address—feeds into a broader media fantasy of personal stereo listening as an intimate form of interpersonal communication, where music always borders on becoming an utterance for one or more imagined interlocutors.

Chapters 34 and 35 close the volume by focusing on the relationship between cinematic listening and interactive media. Tim Summers, studying a number of *Fantasia*-inspired video games produced between 1983 and 2014, discusses differences between listening within the “closed” system of film (where the audio-visual synchronization is fixed) versus an “open” system where players can respond to musical affordances with a degree of control over the forging of new audio-visual relationships and thus are able to engage with the music’s combinatorial possibilities. Michiel Kamp explores the way in which cinematic listening is remediated in VR experiences. He shows how acousmatic sounds, situational ambient music, sound advances, and other film protocols are utilized to negotiate the player’s transition across narrative levels and to create a sense of presence. At the same time, Kamp also notices that music in VR draws attention to its own presence (whether because of intertextual references, game functionality, or ecological salience), and, by so doing, actually reinforces the boundaries between virtual environments and the spaces of everyday life. If Part I started with an exploration of cinema’s archaeological past, Part VI thus ends on cinema’s role in the archaeology of new media.

Imagining Cinematic Listening

In July 2013, Harrison Krix—a prop maker from Atlanta with a large portfolio of science fiction memorabilia and space guns—made a Holophonor. He collated multiple screenshots from *Futurama*, assembled materials including a \$70 “Vito” brand clarinet, a fiberglass pipe,

plenty of LED lights, an acrylic rod, and Arduino circuits, and produced an ingenious and well-crafted replica of Fry's thirtieth-century instrument (see Figure 0.2). In the process, Krix became increasingly aware of the instrument's shifting on-screen ontology. "Sometimes whole sets of keys are missing, sometimes it looks about a foot shorter than normal, and the lower bell seems to be anywhere from 6'' around to over 18'' depending on which frame you're looking at."⁴⁸ Krix's Holophonor doesn't produce smoke, doesn't project holographic images and—to the disappointment of various online reviewers—cannot be used to play music. If the Holophonor gives an imaginary form to the process of cinematic listening, Krix's replica highlights some of the limitations involved in giving a material form to an intangible process. It foregrounds the continuing effort of the imagination required to move between sound and vision, ideas and realization, cultural processes and theorization.

[PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 0.2 HERE]

Through the exploration of genealogies and places, texts and bodies, ancillary products and transmedia experiences, this volume aims to provide a blueprint for the study of *listening to film* and *listening cinematically*. It hopes to make cinematic listening more concrete while also opening up possibilities for future materializations. Significant patterns and motives emerge across sections and suggest alternative pathways through the volume's materials. From the misplaced, compensatory loudness of canned music in early cinema (Ch. 5) to the adrenaline-fueled orchestrations of classical music in blockbuster movies (Ch. 15) and the sonic aggressiveness of film trailers (Ch. 22), this book's contributors testify to the controversial, if long-standing, role that scale and sheer loudness have had in negotiating a sense of the cinematic. They also show how the eventfulness of loud sounds gains meaning in relation to the possibility of sonic intimacy provided by the closeness of a voice, the details of

sound effects, or the sensuousness of a musicalized soundtrack that position the spectator in the role of an eavesdropper (Ch. 5, 11, 18, 20, 33). Throughout the volume, sound is seized upon as an important, discrete channel of narrative information (Ch. 16) that requires the complex co-ordination of socially-recognizable interpretative labor (Ch. 7) while also being an affective vehicle that engages the body at a more visceral level (Ch. 12 and 17-22). And while these different forms of auditory knowledge are not necessarily in conflict, in that a wide range of information (haptic, narrative, personal) is encoded in forms of embodied listening (Ch. 17 and 26), chapters in this volume show how films sometime dramatize the friction between narrative information and sensory impressions through their plots (Ch. 11) or through the (near) rupture of the audiovisual contract (Ch. 21).

Thus *listening to film* is caught in a dynamic relationship between narrative information and sensory engagement, between normative visualizations and imaginative leaps, between control and passivity, between discipline and noisiness, between the large scale and the intimate. The loud and the quiet, the semantic and the somatic, the visceral and the tasteful, the personal and the intersubjective—mediated by specific venues, presentational practices, aesthetics, and discourses—provide some of the broad coordinates within which this Handbook's cinematic sounds engage the listener's imagination.

In the process of tracing these emergent notions of cinematic listening, the book also identifies some of the logics that regulate the movement from listening to film to *listening cinematically*. The connections between cinematic and aural cultures are mediated by shared venues (Ch. 6) and transmedia platforms (Ch. 10), by listening protocols and phenomenological structures (Ch. 32–33), by specific directors, sound engineers, and musicians who work across screen media (Ch. 10, 13, and 31), and also more broadly by a dialogue between music composition and composing for film and between sound design and sound art (Ch. 18 and 21). Musico-imagistic associations travel across and beyond cinematic

texts thanks to representational tropes, musical topics, and pre-existing materials (Ch. 1–4, 15, 27, and 29); they are disseminated by ancillary materials and commercial synergies and reinforced by pedagogical practices (Ch. 23, 24, 25, and 31). What is more, to the extent that cinema frequently refers to its own well-established ways of rendering the world, these processes of repetition and habituation make listening to film always already a form of listening cinematically (Ch. 17 and 28), in a feedback loop that is central to the workings of cinematic listening (Ch. 25).

The patterns and logics that emerge through this volume show some of the possible directions of cinematic listening as an interdisciplinary research area. Collectively, in this volume, we continue to explore the material and aesthetic specificity of cinema while also extending the study of cinematic sound beyond film and beyond the screen. The intention is not to define cinematic listening but rather to open up a debate about what it can be and how it can be studied, in the hope of furthering a dialogue between historical, speculative, technical, and empirical perspectives on film, music, sound, and media, that might—with time—give us an increasingly detailed and differentiated understanding of the relationship between listening cultures and ever-changing notions of the cinematic.

¹ See “Parasites Lost,” the second episode of *Futurama*’s third season (2001). The Holophonor returns in the finale of Season 4 (“The Devil’s Hands are Idle Playthings”) and makes a few other appearances in Seasons 5, 6, and 7.

² Simon Shaw-Miller, *Eye hEar: The Visual in Music* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 187.

³ Michael Long, *Beautiful Monsters: Imagining the Classic in Musical Media* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 246n36.

⁴ Long, *Beautiful Monsters*, 7.

⁵ Long, *Beautiful Monsters*, 24.

⁶ See Simon Frith, *Performing Rites: On the Value of Popular Music* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011), 120. Frith is drawing on Michel Chion, *Audio-Vision: Sound on Screen*, translated by Claudia Gorbman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), 108–9. He also cites evidence from work by Philip Tagg that would later be published as Philipp Tagg and Robert Clarida, *Ten Little Title Tunes: Towards a Musicology of the Mass Media* (New York: The Mass Media Musicologists' Press, 2003).

⁷ See Peter Franklin, “The Boy on the Train, or Bad Symphonies and Good Movies,” in *Beyond the Soundtrack: Representing Music in Cinema*, edited by Richard Leppert, Lawrence Kramer, and Daniel Goldmark (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 13–26: 20.

⁸ See, respectively, Claudia Gorbman, *Unheard Melodies* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987); Anahid Kassabian, *Hearing Film: Tracking Identifications in Contemporary Hollywood Film Music* (New York: Routledge, 2001); Chion, *Audio-Vision*; Nicholas Cook, *Analyzing Musical Multimedia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); Rick Altman, *Sound Theory/Sound Practice* (New York: Routledge, 1992); James Lastra, *Sound Technologies and the American Cinema: Perception, Representation, Modernity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).

⁹ See, in particular, Peter Franklin, *Seeing Through Music: Gender and Modernism in Classic Hollywood Film Scores* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Ben Winters, *Music, Performance, and the Realities of Film: Shared Concert Experiences in Screen Fiction* (New York: Routledge, 2014); Jacob Smith, “Listening to Film Sound,” *The Cine-Files* 8 (2015, “Dossier on Film Sound”); Giorgio Biancorosso, *Situated Listening: The Sound of Absorption in Classical Cinema* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016); Frank Lehman, “Film-as-Concert Music and the Formal Implications of ‘Cinematic Listening,’” *Music*

Analysis 37, no. 1 (2018), 7–46; and Meredith Ward, *Static in the System: Noise and the Soundscape of American Cinema Culture* (Berkeley: California University Press, 2019). The term “cinematic listening” is also found in Sindhumathi Revuluri, “Stereos in the City: Moving through Music in South India,” in the *Oxford Handbook of Mobile Music Studies Vol. II*, edited by Sumanth Gopinath and Jason Stanyek (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 382–98.

¹⁰ The locution is taken from Rick Altman, “Film Sound, All of It,” *iris* 27 (1999, “The State of Sound Studies”), 31–48.

¹¹ It would be foolish to even try to sum up these scholarly achievements, so I will leave the task of mapping out relevant scholarly networks to individual chapters and the Handbook as a whole. I must, however, flag up the work on film sound technology and sound design, which is growing at particularly rapid pace and—arguably—would deserve its own separate volume. The work on film sound technology and sound design, in particular, is growing at rapid pace and would deserve its own separate volume. For a significant sample, see the pioneering work of William Whittington, Mark Kerins, and Jay Beck: William Whittington, *Sound Design and Science Fiction* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007); Mark Kerins, *Beyond Dolby (Stereo): Cinema in the Digital Sound Age* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011); and Jay Beck, *Designing Sound: Audiovisual Aesthetics in 1970s American Cinema* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2016).

¹² See Thomas Elsaesser, *Film History as Media Archaeology: Tracking Digital Cinema* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2016), 71.

¹³ Franklin, “The Boy on the Train,” 16.

¹⁴ Thomas Elsaesser, “The New Film History as Media Archaeology,” *Cinémas: Journal of Film Studies* 14, no. 2–3 (2004), 75–117: 76.

¹⁵ On the foundational myth of the “train effect,” see Martin Loiperdinger, “Lumières Arrival of the Train: Cinema’s Founding Myth,” *The Moving Image* 4, no.1 (2004), 89–113.

Concerns about the combined ideological power of music and moving images are also famously at the centre of Theodor Adorno and Hans Eisler, *Composing for the Films* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947).

¹⁶ Leon Botstein, “Hearing is Seeing—Thoughts on the History of Music and the Imagination,” *The Musical Quarterly* 79, no. 4 (1995), 581–589: 582 and 586.

¹⁷ Imaginary machines such as the one we find in *Futurama* bring these anxieties to the level of representation. Not only does playing the Holophonor require a pact with the Devil, but Fry’s instrument of seduction is a direct descendant of Isaac Asimov’s Visi-Sonor, a mysterious musical instrument that can impress images directly upon the brain, and even kill its listeners. See Isaac Asimov, “The Mule” (Part II), in *Astounding Science Fiction* (December 1945), 60–99 and Asimov, “Tyrann” (Part I), in *Galaxy Science Fiction* (January 1951). Both short stories fed into Asimov’s first interplanetary novel, *Foundation*, which is one of *Futurama*’s frequently acknowledged sources of inspiration. By literally “weaponizing” music, these futuristic cross-sensory machines show what is at stake in cinema’s mediation of the relationship between music, imagination, and subjectivity.

¹⁸ For a discussion of the discursive, social, and political dimensions of the role of subjectivity in the musical experience of romanticism, see James Johnson, *Listening in Paris: A Cultural History* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995).

¹⁹ See Elena del Rio, *Deleuze and the Cinemas of Performance. Powers of Affection* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), 179. Quoted in Julian Hanich, *The Audience Effect: On the Collective Cinema Experience* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018), 25.

²⁰ For an emblematic view of cinema as an “*extension* of the viewer’s embodied existence,” see Vivian Sobchack’s work. The quote is from Laura Marks’s discussion of Sobchack’s phenomenological approach in Marks, *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999), 149, my emphasis.

²¹ The argument about “relocation” is famously made by Francesco Casetti. See for example Casetti and Sara Sampietro, “With Eyes, With Hands: The Relocation of Cinema Into the iPhone,” in *Moving Data: the iPhone and the Future of Media*, edited by Pelle Snickars and Patrick Vonderau (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 19–32. A contrasting perspective on cinema after the digital turn is provided by Raybond Bellour who has argued that “the projection of a film in a cinema, in the dark, as part of an audience” is the only experience that “deserves to be called ‘cinema’.” Raymond Bellour, *La Querelle des dispositifs: cinema—expositions, installations* (Paris: POL, 2012), 14. The passage is translated and discussed in Martine Beugnet, “Miniature Pleasures: On Watching Films on an iPhone,” in *Cinematicity in Media History*, edited by Jeffrey Geiger and Karin Littau (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), 196–201. Beugnet compares Bellour and Casetti’s positions, and touches on some of the implications this has on sound.

²² See Tom Gunning and Elsaesser’s bodies of work.

²³ Elsaesser, *Film History as Media Archaeology*, 94–97. In this sense, talking about “film” and the “cinematic” presents us with problems that are not dissimilar to the ones handled so carefully and productively by Lidia Goher’s discussion of the work-concept in her paradigm-changing *Imaginary Museum of Musical Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

²⁴ Cfr. Altman’s famous critique of the ontologies of sound film in *Sound Theory/Sound Practice*.

²⁵ Jeffrey Geiger and Karin Littau, “Introduction: Cinematicity and Comparative Media,” in *Cinematicity in Media History*, edited by Jeffrey Geiger and Karin Littau (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), 1–20: 6.

²⁶ See for example Leon Gurevitch, “Cinema, Video, Game: Astonishing Aesthetics and the Cinematic “Future” of Computer Graphics,” in *Cinematicity in Media History*, edited by Geiger and Littau, 173–95.

²⁷ See Steven Shaviro, *Post-Cinematic Affect* (Winchester: O Books, 2009), 177.

²⁸ See Lev Manovich, *The Language of New Media* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2001), esp. pages 78–88.

²⁹ Anahid Kassabian, *Ubiquitous Listening: Affect, Attention, and Distributed Subjectivity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013).

³⁰ Anahid Kassabian, “The end of diegesis as we know it?” in *The Oxford Handbook of New Audiovisual Aesthetics*, edited by John Richardson, Claudia Gorbman, and Carol Vernallis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 89–106: 95.

³¹ Similar questions about traces are found in the introduction to two recent anthologies about listening. See Christian Thorau and Hansjakob Ziemer, “The Art of Listening and its Histories,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Music Listening in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 1–33: 21, and Sander van Maas, “Introduction,” in *Thresholds of Listening: Sound, Technics, Space*, edited by Sander van Maas (New York: Fordham University Press, 2015), 1–17: 4.

³² Thorau and Ziemer, “The Art of Listening and its Histories,” 21, emphasis in the original.

³³ About the difficulty of studying film holistically in experimental settings, see for example James Cutting, “Narrative Theories and the Dynamics of Popular Movies,” *Psychonomic Bulletin* 23, no. 6 (2016), 1713–43. For useful reviews of experimental methods applied to film music research in the arts and humanities see, Annabel J. Cohen, “Congruence-

Association Model and Experiments in Film Music: Toward Interdisciplinary Collaboration,” *Music and the Moving Image* 8, no. 2 (2015), 5–24; and Siu-Lan Tan, “From Intuition to Evidence: The Experimental Psychology of Film Music,” in *The Routledge Companion for Screen Music and Sound*, edited by Miguel Mera, Ronald Sadoff, and Ben Winters (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017), 517–30.

³⁴ van Maas, “Introduction,” 2.

³⁵ On intersensoriality and the liminality of listening see also Steven Connor, “Edison’s Teeth: Touching Hearing,” in *Hearing Cultures: Essays in Sound, Listening and Modernity*, edited by Veit Erlmann (Oxford: Berg, 2004), 153–72.

³⁶ See Georgina Born, “Listening, Mediation, Event: Anthropological and Sociological Perspectives,” in *The Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 135, no. 1 (2010), 79–90.

³⁷ The term also has the advantage of preserving the identity of the aural as a distinct sensory point of access, which is something that—as Chion has noted—should not be confused with the multisensory nature of the cinematic experience. See Chion, “Sensory Aspects of Contemporary Cinema” in *The Oxford Handbook of New Audiovisual Aesthetics*, edited by John Richardson, Claudia Gorbman, and Carol Vernallis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 325–330.

³⁸ For a discussion of “musical culture as irreducibly multimedia in nature,” see Cook, *Analysing Musical Multimedia*, 23.

³⁹ Nicholas Cook “Seeing Sounds, Hearing Images: Listening Outside the Modernist Box,” in *Musical Listening in the Age of Technological Reproduction*, edited by Gianmario Borio (Farham: Ashgate, 2015), 185–202. For a cinematic critique of modernist listening, see also Lehman, “Film-as-concert music,” 11. Frank Lehman argues that listening to film-as-concert-music can help us move beyond either “naïve formalism or reflexive anti-formalism.”

⁴⁰ The latter orientation is epitomized by Laura Marks, who sees Steven Shaviro as exemplary of the former. See Marks, *The Skin of Film*, 151.

⁴¹ Gorbman, *Unheard Melodies*, 5.

⁴² For a line of scholarship that emphasizes the “active” dimension of cinematic listening, see Jeff Smith, “Unheard Melodies? A Critique of Psychoanalytic Theories of Film Music,” in *Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies*, edited by David Bordwell and Noël Carroll (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), 230–48; Gianluca Sergi, “The Hollywood Sonic Playground: The Spectator as Listener,” in *Hollywood Spectatorship: Changing Perceptions of Cinema Audiences*, edited by Richard Maltby and Melvyn Stokes (London: British Film Institute, 2001), 121–31; and Paul Grainge, “Selling Spectacular Sound: Dolby and the Unheard History of Technical Trademarks,” in *Lowering the Boom: Critical Studies in Film Sound*, edited by Jay Beck and Tony Grajeda (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 251–68.

⁴³ In recent years, there has been a distinct effort to reframe listening as an “intentional act” (Deborah Kapchan), a move that might be related—among other things—to the participatory turn in new media and thus to new ways of textualizing and recording other previously implicit forms of reception. This rethinking of listening has taken a number of forms, from an emphasis on “listening out” as a form of political engagement to a redefinition of listening as a form of creativity, to a cognitive understanding of listening as “covert performance.” See respectively Deborah Kapchan, “Listening Acts: Witnessing the Pain (and Praise) of Others,” in *Theorizing Sound Writing*, edited by Deborah Kapchan (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 2017), 277–93; 280. Kate Lacey, *The Politics and Experience of Listening in the Media Age* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013); David Hargreaves, Dorothy Miell, and Raymond MacDonald, eds. *Musical Imaginations: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Creativity, Performance and Perception* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Ian Cross,

“Listening as Covert Performance,” *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 125, no. 1 (2010), 67–78.

⁴⁴ In keeping with Elsaesser, I see here the archaeological perspective on film history as “a radicalized version of the genealogical way of thinking . . . where no continuity is implied or assumed.” Elsaesser, *Film History as Media Archaeology*, 93.

⁴⁵ See for example Kassabian, *Hearing Film*; Phil Powrie and Robynn Stilwell eds. *Changing Tunes: The Use of Pre-Existing Music in Film* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006); Winters *Music, Performance, and the Realities of Film*; Biancorosso, *Situated Listening*.

⁴⁶ Marks sees the punch and the caress as metaphorical understandings of cinema’s *visuality*, where “haptic visuality implies making oneself vulnerable to the image, reversing the relation of mastery that characterizes optical viewing.” See Marks, *The Skin of Film*, 185.

⁴⁷ The term is used and defined in Carol Vernallis, Holly Rogers, and Lisa Perrot (eds.), *Transmedia Directors: Artistry, Industry, and New Audiovisual Aesthetics* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2020).

⁴⁸ See Harrison Krix, “Holophonor, Futurama,” *Volpin Props*, blog, July 22, 2013, <http://www.volpinprops.com/holophonor-futurama/>