

Sonority, Difference and the Schwarzenegger Star Body

Gábor Gergely, University of Lincoln

Abstract:

Discussions of the exilic body in Hollywood cinema have tended to focus on the personal trajectories of émigré actors in the context of the broader history of the industry in which they achieved star status. Significant work has been done in particular on the fate of European women stars in Hollywood but what has been rarely addressed, however, is the way in which Hollywood films imagine the exilic experience via the narratives built around specific stars. This article focuses on Arnold Schwarzenegger as one of the dominant stars of the 1980s–1990s, whose foreignness, accent and body are used in a remarkably consistent set of aesthetic, generic and narrative practices. The article uses Jean-Luc Nancy’s concept of sonority to argue that the sonorous presence of the foreign other in the “host” space produces a new space; it produces the space of the host anew as one in which the foreign other is present despite the discursive denial of the possibility of that presence whilst at the same time producing a new self as distinct from the self before displacement. The article’s aim is to highlight the ways in which Hollywood films produce and reproduce foreignness as an impossibility, a presence that cannot be. The use of the foreign star, I argue, is to perform the permeability of the boundary between outside and inside, while also policing it.

Keywords: Stardom; Exile; Sonority; Difference; Accent; Schwarzenegger.

I would like to begin this article on what I call the exilic self in Hollywood cinema with a discussion of the revolutionary and also reactionary male pregnancy comedy *Junior* (Ivan Reitman, 1994). Its star,

Film-Philosophy 23.2 (2019): 137–158

DOI: 10.3366/film.2019.0106

© Gábor Gergely. This article is published as Open Access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial Licence (<http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction provided the original work is cited. For commercial re-use, please refer to our website at: www.eupublishing.com/customer-services/authors/permissions.
www.eupublishing.com/film

Arnold Schwarzenegger, is the primary focus of this article, which draws on Hamid Naficy's (2001) notion of the exilic and Jean-Luc Nancy's (2007) analysis of the role of sonority in the construction of the self.¹ The article proposes a new understanding of the "foreign" émigré star body as an impossible presence. The sonority of the exilic body – the way in which that body relates to or interacts with the space around the body – is in tension with the visible exilic body. This tension between the presence of the exilic body in sonorous and visible terms is what I call an impossible presence: a body that is different to itself, produced in the space of the host as a product of the mutual referral between a body and space. 1
5
10

Junior builds on the success of the previous Reitman-Schwarzenegger-De Vito collaboration, *Twins* (1989), and echoes the simple yet outlandish² set-up of that piece. Schwarzenegger plays uptight Austrian obstetric pharmacologist Dr Alex Hesse. Working with the undisciplined but resourceful fertility specialist Dr Lawrence Arbogast (Danny de Vito), Hesse develops a drug that suppresses the immune system's reaction to the presence of a foreign body. Their expectation is that the drug, Expectane, would help reduce the risk of a miscarriage. Denied funding, the duo decide to test the drug on Hesse. The greatest difficulties being presented by the need to avoid detection, the embryo is successfully carried to term and Hesse becomes a proud mother-father, and equal beneficiary, with Arbogast, of a lucrative pharmaceutical patent. 15
20

Just as *Twins*, *Junior* provides opportunities for humour deriving from the crude contrast of opposites. However, the explicit acknowledgement of Hesse's foreign birth, and his fascination with immunology and work around the suppression of the body's natural, antagonistic response to contamination by foreign bodies, takes this "odd couple" comedy into a zone of contestation between native and alien. This is reinforced through the multiple displacements of Hesse: he is from a small village in Austria, so small that Arbogast feels he can safely invent a fictitious genetic disease unique to that space, which might explain away Hesse's Expectane and oestrogen-induced nausea. When Hesse seeks specialist care in an exclusive retreat for pregnant women, he is presented as a former East German Olympic athlete, victim of the state's systemic doping 25
30
35

1. I use "self" in the sense in which Nancy uses it in *Listening*: "A self is nothing other than a form or function of referral: a self is made of a relationship to self, or of a presence to self, which is nothing other than the mutual referral between a perceptible individuation and an intelligible identity" (2007, p. 8). 40

2. I use this term deliberately as outlandish in the common sense of weird, but also as from beyond the land/zone of the norm.

The Schwarzenegger Star Body

programme. Geographical displacement is thus reinforced through displacement from a seemingly fixed gender category. This layered geographical displacement coupled with displacement from the gender norm is not limited to *Junior*. It can be apprehended in virtually all Schwarzenegger films (e.g., the *Terminator* series' asexual time-travelling cyborg and *Total Recall*'s [Verhoeven, 1990] Quaid/Hauser disguised as a monstrous woman to name just two).

The difference (from the norm, that is to say the ordinary) of the Schwarzenegger body is performed in *Junior* in several ways. It is initially performed by Arbogast through the act of selecting Hesse as a suitable host for the fertilized egg. Arbogast's reasoning that Schwarzenegger is a robust man and therefore a suitable guinea pig fleetingly reveals the coding of the Schwarzenegger star body as more, therefore less, than human. The curious scene when Arbogast implants the fertilized egg into Hesse's abdomen is a second performance of this normative view of the Schwarzenegger star body as beyond the norm. As the thick needle pricks his belly, Hesse makes a manly noise to acknowledge pain and indicate his ability to withstand it. This is a moment of masculine anxiety that may have been intended as recognition of the pains, trials and labours of pregnancy. However, it is also a radical performance of the hypermasculine body's distance from the ordinary, that is to say, from the norm. That Hesse is chosen for the experiment – and that Schwarzenegger the actor was cast in the role – means the Schwarzenegger body is seen as a possible site for the reconfiguration of gender – that is to say, a body that does not fit into a binary view of gender; an impossible body – both by the filmic characters and the producers, director, scriptwriters and the financiers who greenlit the project. This reaffirms the Schwarzenegger body's position in a zone beyond the norm. This position beyond the norm, not always linked to his extraordinary physique, can be apprehended in all Schwarzenegger films. The realization that Schwarzenegger films all seem to accommodate such a reading has prompted what is to follow.

In Hollywood cinema, foreigners disrupt the space of a secure community which is imagined as precluding the possibility of the presence of a foreign body. A national community is imagined in Hollywood cinema as the outcome of the elimination of the disrupting presence of the foreign body (e.g., *Dracula* [Tod Browning, 1931]; *Alien* [Ridley Scott, 1979]; *X-Men Apocalypse* [Bryan Singer, 2016]).³ The foreign

3. Although I use it in the sense of foreign national, foreign may be broadly understood as anything outside the norm.

body is crucial to this cinematic nation-building project: it is used to tell cautionary tales of insufficient transformation, of failure to be reconstituted via the crucible as “fully American”.⁴ 1

Sound plays a key role in the discourse of belonging: the resonance/harmony of those sounds, things, bodies that belong is contrasted with the negative notion of the noise of an unwanted presence (Thompson, 2017, pp. 3–6). Although sound studies has already moved beyond understanding noise as merely unwanted sound (Thompson, 2017, p. 3), the aural aspects of an unwanted presence have remained relatively unexamined in the context of critical writing on the foreign in the cinema, and virtually nothing has been written about Schwarzenegger’s accent or voice, despite the centrality of his vocal performance to his star persona. It is my aim to address the notion of the unwanted presence or noise of the foreign body: a presence manifested through a noise – which is also a presence – unlinked from the architecture of the space in which it is made. 5 10 15

Schwarzenegger’s career trajectory, from Austria to California, from bodybuilding to film stardom to high political office, his much-imitated accent and voice, and his unique physique load his star body with a wide range of meanings. These meanings are at times overlapping, at others in conflict. His association with the Republican Party and his extraordinarily successful quest to accumulate physical and abstract power (muscles, property, political capital, stardom) at times sit uncomfortably with his outsider status, which he has drawn on in his political career as a maverick challenging the status quo. The epithet given him by George Bush Sr, “Conan the Republican” (Nichols, 1992, pp. 41–42), neatly expresses these contradictions: he is both an embodiment of Republican values of self-realization and accumulation of various forms of capital, and a body whose foreign origin is audible in his every utterance, indelibly associated with his infamous comparison of “pumping iron” with the sensation of ejaculation as much as with his campaign to “Terminate gerrymandering”.⁵ There is 20 25 30

4. See, Ali Behdad’s *A Forgetful Nation* (2005). 35

5. See *Pumping Iron* (Butler & Fiore, 1977). “It’s as satisfying to me as, uh, coming is, you know? As, ah, having sex with a woman and coming. And so can you believe how much I am in heaven? I am like, uh, getting the feeling of coming in a gym, I’m getting the feeling of coming at home, I’m getting the feeling of coming backstage when I pump up, when I pose in front of 5,000 people, I get the same feeling, so I am coming day and night. I mean, it’s terrific. Right? So you know, I am in heaven.” (from IMDb.com) For the campaign to terminate gerrymandering see <https://www.crowdpac.com/campaigns/386151/join-arnold-schwarzeneggers-crusade-to-terminate-gerrymandering>. 40

The Schwarzenegger Star Body

tension, too, deriving from the incoherence of the body-building 1
movement, which celebrates an unhealthy lifestyle as the epitome of
health and posits narcissism, a total focus on the perfection of the
physical self, as being in the service of the common good (Dyer,
1997, pp. 145–155). The whiff of ludicrousness of a beauty pageant 5
masquerading as a “sport” rubs off on the Schwarzenegger star body, and
marks it, too, as faintly ludicrous. These tensions can be traced in the
films, which tell silly stories of a firefighter-turned special operations
counterinsurgency commando with a genius for IEDs (*Collateral Damage*,
Andrew Davis, 2002), a leisure-pilot killed as part of a political 10
assassination and then cloned to cover up the killing (*Sixth Day*, Roger
Spottiswoode, 2000), a violent cop who goes undercover in a nursery
to interrogate children, one of whom may be the child of a vicious
criminal’s runaway wife (*Kindergarten Cop*, Ivan Reitman, 1990), a twice-
married immigrant, whose daughter from his first marriage is slowly 15
becoming a zombie, putting the new family at risk of infection (*Maggie*,
Henry Hobson, 2015).

At the heart of these outlandish stories is the nagging thought that
the presence of the Schwarzenegger body is an impossible presence.
The pregnant man, the arsonist firefighter, the erased eraser (*Eraser*, 20
Chuck Russel, 1996), the slobby body-builder (*End of Days*, Peter Hyams,
1999) are all repetitions with difference of the original articulations
of the Schwarzenegger body as impossible. This impossibility of the
Schwarzenegger star body feeds from the discourse around his extra-
ordinary physique and string of consecutive triumphs as Mr Olympia 25
(1970–1975). His first film, *Hercules in New York* (Arthur A. Seidelman,
1970) explicitly builds on the hyperbolic language of body-building,
performing the philosophically impossible feat of bringing a god
to Earth, namely bringing the Platonic ideal to flesh-and-bone life.
However, it was his two breakout performances, as *Conan the* 30
Barbarian (John Milius, 1982) and as the *Terminator* (James Cameron,
1984), that established the underlying notion of a body that ought
not to be (here). The scene of the wheel of pain in *Conan the Barbarian*
serves as a good example to explain the construction of a body whose
presence in a given space is a denial of the rules that seem to govern 35
that space.

We see the making of Conan. He is orphaned. He is cast into
slavery and marched from his native frozen North to the scorching
South, where he is shackled to a giant wheel which he drives day
and night. A montage that focuses on his limbs and the shoulder 40
length hair that hangs over his eyes constitutes Conan as
fragmented: an assembly of body parts that challenges his wholeness.

Film-Philosophy 23 (2019)

Bound⁶ to the giant wheel we see him accrue muscle tissue. Compelled to expend energy, he converts power output into accumulated strength. We do not see him eat anything. In other words, net energy expenditure – hard labour alongside insufficient nourishment – results in accretion of muscle tissue. This is alien physics. Or rather, this is normative discourse positing the foreign other as operating under its own rules of space and time, as existing outside the realm of known physics, the here and now. His bodily development is achieved in spite of the conditions under which he exists. Indeed, all his fellow slaves perish one by one. Conan moves forward in time, but spatially stays in place, all the while acquiring power, like a self-winding spring. He is on an impossible perpetual journey – an unending dislocation nonetheless bound in space – whose destination is his adult body-built self.

Similarly, Conan acquires a solid identity under conditions that are not conducive to the emergence of a secure self. He is in a position of total exploitation, first as forced labourer, then as gladiator. He is denied the fundamentals of a secure identity, yet he acquires precisely that: a sense of self, a set of values for which he is willing to fight, and inspires friendship and loyalty in others. Displaced from his place of birth, cut off from family, language and history, denied comfort and nurture, shackled and exploited, put on display as the foreign other that constitutes (affirms, performs, defines) the norm by embodying its opposite, he becomes that which he has no right to be: a viable body.⁷ He is not an exceptional individual endowed with extraordinary powers, at least not in the sense of a body that is better or more. Rather, he is so exceptional as to be fantastic, in the sense of belonging to the realm of fantasy, that is to say, an impossible body constituted under conditions wholly antagonistic to such constitution. This impossible body is the product of a mutual referral between a body and a space that obey different rules. The body that does not perish where bodies cannot thrive, the body that is impervious to forces that bodies cannot withstand is a body that does not obey the rules of the space that has produced it and which is, in its turn, produced by such a body, in a process of mutual referral. This impossible body produces a space(time) out of joint, and a body out of place(time).

6. I would like to note a connection here with Laura Mulvey's analysis of the way in which woman is "bound by a symbolic order in which man can live out his phantasies and obsessions through linguistic command by imposing them on the silent image of woman still tied to her place as bearer of meaning, not maker of meaning" (1975/2004, p. 838).

7. Here I refer to Judith Butler's notion of the body that is deemed viable by heteronormative phallogocentric discourse (1993).

The Schwarzenegger Star Body

The presence of such an impossible (out-of-place) body in a space (out-of-joint) is an impossible presence. 1

The Accent

Much has been written about Schwarzenegger's physique. However, his voice has attracted few comments, despite its centrality to Schwarzenegger's star persona. 5

Throughout *Terminator* we switch to the cyborg's point of view, and see in practice how he tries to make sense of his environment through a knowledge constituted elsewhere. His built-in sensors scan the environment and provide him with a constant stream of information, which allows him to make sense of phenomena that otherwise would remain meaningless for him. He is a machinic assemblage operating with a knowledge of the world and of himself acquired in a different time: the future. He is the product of a non-human intelligence. His knowledge was then constituted elsewhere, elsewhen and by someone else (other than human). In the film's representational scheme this elsewhere and elsewhen is a destroyed Los Angeles that exists alongside the present LA in Kyle Reese's (Michael Biehn) flashbacks. 10 15

This foreign origin is most strikingly revealed in *Terminator* in the killing machine's accented speech. In order to unpack the significance of the T800's Austrian accent, I turn to the scene when, on the run from the relentless cyborg sent to destroy her to prevent the birth of her still unconceived child, Sarah Connor (Linda Hamilton) phones home to reassure her mother that she is safe. Little does she suspect that speaking at the other end of the line is not Mrs Connor, but the Terminator speaking in the late Mrs Connor's voice. Here is concrete proof: the Terminator is able to modulate his voice to imitate anyone. It is important to note that he does not play back utterances, but speaks in the voice of those it has heard speak. Yet, when the T800 approaches three punks and demands their clothes, he speaks in a thick Austrian accent. The Schwarzenegger body, including the noise it makes, is read as originating outside "our present day" and therefore, in the film's blurred spatial-temporal regime, outside our space. The meaning of the accent in this instance is clear: it indicates out-of-placeness, not-from-here-ness. 20 25 30 35

Naficy (2001) defines the accent as a departure from a universal and unaccented dominant form. He draws on David Crystal's dictionary of linguistics to argue that an accent is "the cumulative auditory effect of those features of pronunciation which identify where a person is from" (Naficy, 2001, p. 22). Taking this as a starting point, for Naficy, the accent in the cinema demarcates individual and collective identities (2001, 40

pp. 24-25). It is rooted in the utterance, and is a marker of difference. It fixes identity in and to a specific place of origin. 1

The notion of the accent helps Naficy to attach a label to the fluid and hybrid interstitial and artisanal practice of exile and diaspora filmmakers, which strains against and defies generic and national brackets. In Naficy's view, "the dominant cinema is driven by the hegemony of synchronous sound and a strict alignment of speaker and voice" while "accented films are counterhegemonic [...] de-emphasize synchronous sound [and] insist on first-person and other voice-over narrations delivered in the accented pronunciation of the host country's language" (2001, p. 24). 5 10

Although Naficy acknowledges that émigrés, exiles and diaspora artists have played an important role in Hollywood's classical era, he sees Hollywood as a producer of entertainment that refuses to narrativize and problematize exclusion. In Naficy's conceptualization of accented cinema and its other, Hollywood entertainment cinema, Schwarzenegger's films belong to the unaccented, universal norm. This ignores the obvious: Schwarzenegger's accent, and the insistence of the films in which he appears on asking questions about belonging, displacement and exclusion. After all, what is *Terminator* if not a story concerning an extraordinary body who has come from elsewhere and threatens the integrity and the very existence of the here and now? 15 20

It is evident that Schwarzenegger's films address questions of an accented identity as closely as any of the accented films that Naficy analyses. Furthermore, the accent permeates, in Naficy's terms, "the deep structure" (2001, p. 23) of Schwarzenegger's films – their narrative, visual style, characters, subject matter, theme and plot – as comprehensively as it does the deep structure of the films in the focus of *An Accented Cinema* (2001). Indeed, this article is intended to excavate the deep structures of the films that constitute the Schwarzenegger body of work to show a consistent discourse around foreignness, displacement, not fitting and being inorganic at work. 25 30

It would seem that Naficy's reading of the accent as a departure from a universal standard locates difference in the body of the other. To determine the accent in relation to difference from an arbitrary norm is to maintain a dichotomy that serves power by positioning one (the subject, "us") as unmarked and the other (the object, "them") as marked. We must displace the accent from the utterance of the speaker and think of it as belonging not to speech, but to hearing. Accent, therefore, is an aspect of perception. This rethinking of the accent as an aspect of the process of hearing allows us to move away from a view that places the blame for its difference on the body perceived as different (from that of the perceiver). If the accent is not an inherent part of speech, but the name 35 40

The Schwarzenegger Star Body

given to something perceived, it is then no longer a matter of perceiving an inherent difference (from the perceiving body) in a body that cannot speak without an accent. This helps us break the problematic dichotomy of native accent versus an accent acquired not “at birth” and not “from the maternal”. It does not matter where an accent is acquired, because as we will note, all accents are continuously in the process of being acquired.

The accent is not a mark. A mark is evidence of an event. It is an inscription; an impact. It is an addition to a pre-existing form. An accent, when applied to the spoken language, is not something that can be said to exist on top of an unaccented pre-existing ideal. Strip the accent away and we are not left with what linguists have called “standard language and its corollary, non-accent” (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 41). As Lippi-Green suggests after Milroy and Milroy (1991), non-accent is an “idea in the mind rather than a reality – a set of abstract norms to which actual usage may conform to a greater or lesser extent” (1997, p. 41). A comparison of that which we encounter and an abstract ideal is prejudice by another name. To put it another way, it seems clear that a comparison that takes an imaginary norm as its benchmark cannot yield an accurate or fair analysis. If the accent is not a mark that exists on top of an abstract ideal and cannot be removed to reveal the proper pronunciation it smothers, then it does not exist in the space and instance of articulation. If it is not a set of markers distributed in spoken language to delineate a foreign identity, it cannot reside in the speech organs. It can be said to exist only in the space and moment of perception. Linguists, for instance Verhoeven, De Pauw, Pettinato, Hirson, Van Borsel and Mariën agree that “the foreign accent does not reside in the speaker, but in the perception of the listener” (2013, p. 157).

There are no markers laid down for the listener to follow. Rather, the listener identifies a set of features that she or he does not use. They are not there in order to delineate foreignness. They have no identifiable function. They are selected on the basis that the listener does not use them. They are organic, integral parts of the non-native speaker’s way of speaking. Yet they are perceived as being out of place. Based on features perceived by the listener to be out of place in the speaker’s speech, the listener extrapolates out-of-placeness: difference. This difference is then given a label, such as Hungarian, Mexican or Austrian. Foreignness is thus established as cause from which the features perceived as manifestations of difference had derived. The features perceived by the listener may be linked to idiosyncratic physiological attributes, class identity, quirk of language acquisition, vocal fry or any number of other factors. Sounds that, if made by a native speaker may be identified as deriving from

a physiological idiosyncrasy, are linked to, and heard as, signposts of foreignness. 1

As a result of this attribution of specific but diverse and incoherent characteristics to general, abstract and simultaneously specific foreignness (membership of particular language, cultural, national or ethnic communities), perception of a relationship of difference is projected back onto the body (the speaker) as its essential difference. “I am unlike the speaker” becomes “the speaker is different”. Difference is decontextualized. The comparison, which had given the label meaning, is elided. We are left with one side of a binary comparison. The other side has been taken for granted as standard, and then suppressed. The body marked as different – of colour, queer, trans, accented, etc. – is held up alone without that which it differs from. A body that is not different to self is defined by the characteristics it does not share with an other, while this other masquerades as unmarked, unaccented, of no colour, fixed and known. 5 10 15

The accent, every bit as slippery and vague as the notion of the nation (Hayward, 2005, p. 4), plays a key role in sustaining a binary where one is perceived as deviating from a standard or prototype, while the other is assumed to fit the standard or prototype to the extent that they come to stand for that standard or prototype. And the other is assumed to fit the prototype of the community into which they are inserted on the basis of their perceived difference from whichever norm is being applied. Thus, individual characteristics can become typical of an entire community – for instance, the Hungarian who pronounces “the” and “this” with an initial d; the Frenchperson who pronounces “these” with an initial z; the German who has no sense of humour. 20 25

As we have established, the accent exists not as a meaningful linguistic concept, but as a word in common currency that mobilizes a set of meanings around relations between two or more interlocutors. In this sense, it exists as various and varied aspects of an utterance that are heard and categorized by the listener as indicators of geographical and temporal position. 30

And yet, we must engage with the concept of the accent because, as Verhoeven et al. have shown, native speakers do, on the whole, correctly identify non-native speakers with a great degree of accuracy: 99 per cent of native speakers will correctly identify other native speakers of their language, and 97.5 per cent of native speakers will correctly identify non-native speakers of their language (Verhoeven et al., 2013, pp. 165–166). Where they have had prior encounters with non-native speakers from a particular place, native speakers will in future encounters correctly identify native speakers of that place (Verhoeven et al., 2013, 35 40

The Schwarzenegger Star Body

pp. 165–166). The accent, although not a meaningful linguistic term,⁸ 1
exists, as evidenced by these numbers. (Is this any different from
asserting that members of a “race” are by and large successful in
identifying other members of the same “race”?)

However, the accent does not exist as a constant. It is not continuously 5
present when a non-native speaker is present. It exists only when speech
occurs. It is linked to the space of utterance in the same way that any
sound is linked to the space in which it is produced and perceived. But
because the accent exists in the ear of the listener, it is linked to the space 10
of the imagined community of “us”. A foreign accent can only be heard
here. The accent always and already means a crossing of space, a
dislocation or displacement. Therefore, the accent is also always and
already a questioning of the integrity of the space the imagined
community of “us” imagines itself to be securely bound by. But it is not 15
the speaker who asks the question about the integrity of the space of “us”.
It is, instead, the listener, who perceives difference, that asks such a
question. I return to the question of the integrity of the space in which the
voice/sounds of the foreign body are heard later on.

Accent, Noise, Affect 20

We can make sense of the accent as belonging in a discourse of sound in
which noise is understood as an audible problem (Thompson, 2013,
p. 14). As Marie Thompson argues, prevailing negative narratives of noise
as unwanted, unpleasant or even unbearable sound “have left noise 25
vulnerable to moralising polemics which construct silence and noise as a
dichotomy between the past and present, natural and cultural [...] and,
fundamentally, between good and bad” (2013, p. 13). The view of the
accent as expression or evidence of inherent difference is part of this
moralizing dichotomy between a voice in which no audible expression of
difference nor unpleasantness can be caught, and one that is impure and 30
tainted by noise: foreignness.

If we think of *parole*, utterance, as text, we can think of the listener, with
Roland Barthes (1989), as author of the text. In this sense, then, the
accent is authored by the listener. It is the name we give to the listener’s
inference on the basis of their authorship of the speaker’s text that the 35

8. The accent is a “fuzzy term”, Lippi Green notes (1997, p. 42), a not very helpful label
attached to some types of phonetic/spoken language variation that are difficult to
distinguish from others. Just as the borders between (language) communities are
vague, porous and imaginary, so too, the accent, as a label attached to a given 40
community’s spoken language attributes, lacks precision and, thus, lacks meaning as a
linguistic term.

speaker is from “here” or “elsewhere”. It follows that the accent is always 1
the product of a specific instance of comparison and as such unfixed.
Reiterations of difference, daily encounters that begin with “where’s that
accent from?”, work to fix the accent as coherent, real and present. The
other function of this discursive fixing of the accent as an aspect of the 5
speech of the interlocutor is to dislodge the interlocutor from the space of
utterance. The presence of the accent highlights the presence here of a
body that has come from elsewhere. The accent is heard as noise and thus
the foreigner is discursively marked as noisome, present in a system, place
or space, which their presence disturbs and disrupts. The accent, then, 10
marks a presence that is antagonistic to the claims inherent in the
production of the space of a community, a space defined by the
community, which imagines itself defined by it (Anderson, 2006). An
examination of Schwarzenegger’s speech, then, is necessary.

Sound recorded for the cinema goes through as many and as varied 15
transformations as the image itself (Robertson Wojcik, 2006, p. 75). Just
as the star body is subject to lighting practices, make-up, the colourist’s
wizardry, the editor’s scissors and the cinematographer’s lens, so too the
star’s voice is subject to a series of transformations on set, in the post-
production booth and the sound systems of multiplex cinemas. This 20
means that the voice work of any actor should not be read as an indivisible
whole, or as a natural entity emanating solely from the star body. As
Pamela Robertson Wojcik writes in an article on sound in film acting:

despite the seeming integration of voice and body in film performance, film 25
performance occurs in multiple time segments [...] dialogue may or may
not be recorded by various kinds of microphones and at different angles; in
the looping booth, where actors may add dialogue to scenes shot [without
sound], ‘fix’ a line, change a reading, clarify a word, or record a censored or
foreign version; at the mixing board, where spoken lines may be filtered, 30
sweetened, split onto separate tracks, adjusted for acoustics, equalized, and
blended, and more; and in the cinema, where the voice may be delivered
through multiple or single speakers, in Dolby or THX. (2006, pp. 78–79)

And yet, actors are made personally responsible for their accents as a key 35
part of the voice performance. Robertson Wojcik cites Gianluca Sergi,
who suggests that “ ‘factors [...] under the actor’s control’” include the
“accent, volume, pauses, hesitations, and the ability to play off other
actors and within the soundscape” (2006, p. 75). Few would assume that
an actor’s wardrobe is their own. The voice work of the performer needs 40
more nuanced attention.

Following the above logic, the voice of an emigrant actor does not
pertain to the body anymore than the accent belongs to the speech. The

The Schwarzenegger Star Body

voice of the emigrant actor is an aspect of broad popular discourse 1
around the foreign body as constructed through the institutional and
aesthetic practices of a centre for cultural production, such as Hollywood.
In this vein, Schwarzenegger's lines speak of a curious displacement at
work. For instance, Conan's infamous pronouncement of what is best in 5
life sounds out of place. As he answers, "To crush your enemy. See them
driven before you. And to hear the lamentation of their women", there is a
marked change in the sound. Conan's line is louder than other lines
spoken in the scene. It stands out. It is clearer than the rest. There is 10
a suspicion of the sound studio, as if the line had not been recorded
on the sound stage. It may be that the line has been spliced together
from several takes, and inserted into the sequence. The impression of
Schwarzenegger's lines being out of place endures across the oeuvre. As
the T800 approaches its first victims in *Terminator*, he utters a demand,
"Your clothes. Give them to me!" Unlike Conan's tinny voice, this is a low, 15
deep voice. Conan's pronouncement is a shout that lacks articulateness.
After all, he is a barbarian, who speaks a language that is not his native
tongue. The T800's order is precisely spoken. His speech is marked as
being out of place by gaps that precede and follow the utterance. This
seems true of the Schwarzenegger voice work in general: he speaks into 20
gaps. At the same time, his speech is limited in its inflection. In *Terminator*
it is flatter than Conan's. There is no sense of interpersonal communi-
cation – of dialogue – but of speech acts that demand a reaction, rather
than a spoken response. When at his most affectionate, there is still an
absence of inflection. As a result, the emotion implicit in the lines is not 25
conveyed in the delivery. This is illustrated by the dialogue in the opening
scene of *Commando* (Mark L. Lester, 1986). John Matrix and his daughter,
Jenny (Alyssa Milano), enjoy a moment of domestic bliss over a sandwich
and a glass of milk. They joke about the bizarre combination of sandwich
ingredients Jenny has used, and he makes a homo/transphobic comment 30
about Boy George, "Why don't they call him Girl George?" The exchange
is meant to be an ordinary conversation like anyone might have
around American breakfast counters and dinner tables, but it is rendered
extraordinary by the gaps left either side of Schwarzenegger's lines. These
gaps, left by the editor, enhance the sense, created by the perception of an 35
accent, that Schwarzenegger's delivery is unnatural.

Schwarzenegger's accent should not be read, or heard, as indicating the
star's failure to master English or to build his speech organs in the way
he has built his body. The Schwarzenegger accent tells us very little about 40
Schwarzenegger the actor. The Schwarzenegger accent tells us more about
Hollywood practices of representations of foreignness than anything else.
It tells us that for Hollywood a foreign body is as interchangeably foreign

as it had been when Peter Lorre was cast as Spanish, Hungarian and Japanese in successive films.⁹ It tells us that for Hollywood a foreign star's chief appeal is in the interpellation of a community united by a realization of the foreign star's difference from recognized members of the community. The accent is essential for this project.

Without nuancing the foregoing, it would appear that Hollywood's use and representation of foreign star bodies is purely antagonistic. However, the enduring appeal of foreign stars and the affection many moviegoers have for them shows that we do need to nuance our understanding of Hollywood's use of émigré, diaspora and exile stars.

We can do some of this nuancing by considering the tensions between the affective and the affected in relation to Schwarzenegger's body and work (Thompson, 2013, pp. 147–148). The ever-present tension between affective (capable of affecting) and affected (able to be affected) derives from narratives spun around Schwarzenegger's extraordinary physique. A helpful example to illustrate this tension is, once again, *Junior*. This film is a radical formulation of the tension between Schwarzenegger's hypermasculine built body and its potential to become a maternal body. The remarkable body of the star bodybuilder is re-markable as a body capable of affection, of being affected and of becoming woman (Deleuze, 2004). By this I mean that the Schwarzenegger body – associated with the violent marking out of territory as exemplified by Dutch's roar, and the armed remaking of the jungle space in *Predator* (John McTiernan, 1987) – is itself also capable of being remade, receiving an inscription and mark of radical departure from the norm. In the instance of Schwarzenegger's stardom – a foreign star, that is to say a “cultural sign” (Hayward, 2004) that simultaneously embodies notions of success and difference – the distance of the hypermasculine from the norm authorizes a transgression. Or rather, hypermasculinity is here an initial transition into a space beyond the liveable zone (in Butler's terms), beyond the ordinary body range defined by the interval between Langella (tall and thin) and De Vito (short and stocky), into an affected/affective, liminal space of becoming pregnant-therefore-woman. The built body has transitioned and thus is capable of a further movement away from masculinity towards femininity, a movement achieved via too much masculinity, hence becoming beyond the norm. The Terminator stands in stark contrast as an affective body that is

9. Ugarte in *Casablanca* (Michael Curtiz, 1942), Lorenz in *The Boogie Man Will Get You* (Lew Landers, 1942) and Baron Ikito in *Invisible Agent* (Edwin L. Marin, 1942).

The Schwarzenegger Star Body

unaffected. It causes bodily transformation – fatal transformation into 1
dead matter – but itself cannot be affected. (Perhaps *Terminator 2:
Judgement Day*'s [Cameron, 1991] T-1000 [Robert Patrick] was born of a
realization of the terrifying nature of that notion.)

The affective/affected tension in the Schwarzenegger body of work can 5
be further teased out of the Schwarzenegger voice, and how it is recorded,
mixed and played back for us to perceive. As I suggested above, the
Schwarzenegger voice is out of place. His lines do not overlap with the
lines spoken by others. His lines are spoken into gaps. This displaces his
lines from interpersonal communication. What I referred to above, as a 10
suspicion of the studio, is an articulation of a sense of the absence of
architectural space. The Schwarzenegger voice gives the impression of not
emanating from, being emitted in, or resounding in the space in which
the body is present. In a sense this displaces the body from the space of
the narrative (the diegetic) and, as I argue in the final section of this 15
article, from what I have called the space of the normative, the host, the
here. Moreover, the unaffected delivery of the lines – what one might term
the flatter grain of the Schwarzenegger voice – means that the body
does not figure in the voice as much as we might expect: there is less
affect. The Schwarzenegger voice is then constructed as out of place, 20
displaced and inorganic, that is, marked as not from here. His voice
therefore impacts upon our perception of his humanity by distancing
and dehumanizing him.

Let us now move on to consider the Schwarzenegger scream. It runs 25
counter to the discourse of exclusion explored so far and represents an
articulation of the essential humanity of the foreign body despite the
many ways in which the contrary is asserted. Every film in the corpus
up to Schwarzenegger's election as Governor of California in 2003
features a scream, a yelp of pain, a gargle of confusion or an outburst
of rage, except for the *Terminator* films where this absence of vocalizations 30
of distress point to the inhumanity of the character, an inhumanity
that rubs off on the actor, an inhumanity that Schwarzenegger has
come to embody. The sheer range of the Schwarzenegger scream is
remarkable.

The scream is a sudden expulsion of air linked to emotional state. It is 35
the first noise we make as humans and our one-size-fits-all way of
communicating basic feelings of want, pain, presence or existence. In
Deleuzian terms, the scream renders audible the inaudible forces that
prompt the scream (2003, pp. 60–61). As Gilles Deleuze's (2003)
discussion of Francis Bacon's paintings of screaming figures indicates, 40
the scream itself and its very force is the body made audible and visible.
The scream, for Deleuze, is the body itself, made audible in one of its

possible affective states. As such, the scream is a source of extraordinary vitality (Deleuze, 2003, p. 61). 1

Thompson (2013) argues that a scream is an affecting noise, namely a noise that has an affect and causes other bodies to react. It is a “sonorous-affective force [...] responsible for the transference [...] of affects from one body to another” (2013, p. 147), hence its use in horror films and torture chambers (2013, pp. 156–157). But, as Thompson notes, the scream also exists independently from expressing and perceiving bodies (2013, pp. 156–157). A scream is usually described as inarticulate, yet we link it to primal emotions and sensations, as if a scream were self-evident. But, not all that is articulated in a scream can be translated into language without loss of meaning. It is precisely this that makes a scream a scream: its unrealized potential to communicate, its communication of something that is not fully understood, and its communication of the impossibility of giving words to something understood. Thompson warns that some of this “paralinguistic, amorphous outburst” (2013, p. 149) exists outside of the matrix of perception. She adds, “there is always something of the scream-sound that evades us, that remains unheard, unfelt and imperceptible” (2013, p. 162). There is a productive tension here between the loud sound that cannot be fully heard and the excessive presence of the hypermasculine built body, which is somehow not fully here. Just as the scream is a shattering presence, a mutual referral of an affective body and a space where the totality of that presence (sound) cannot be fully perceived by a subject, so too, Schwarzenegger’s star body is a disruptive presence which remains not fully perceived. 5 10 15 20 25

Thinking of the scream as affective, affecting and as scream-itself, we can begin to make sense of the Schwarzenegger scream and its role in Schwarzenegger films as an expression of the fundamental tension in this affected and affective star body. As I argued earlier, the Schwarzenegger body is seen by Hollywood and its audiences as a possible site of the reconfiguration of gender and the human. It is both an inorganic body that destroys the maternal and a body of such affective potential that it can incubate and give birth to an embryo in the absence of generative organs. The scream, whether the hiss of the Terminator’s damaged hydraulics systems or the labour pain vocalizations of Alexander Hesse, works to express an underlying body-ness, which is simultaneously denied by the discourse that constructs that body as grotesque, excessive and extraordinary (that is, outside the norm). The scream is heard in every Schwarzenegger film. John Kimble screams his frustration into the air outside the kindergarten when his young charges defy 30 35 40

The Schwarzenegger Star Body

his authority.¹⁰ Quaid screams as he removes the tracker from his 1
sinus cavity and Hauser smiles encouragingly from the video screen.
Quaid's humanity is affirmed by the scream, but this body-ness is
undermined, counteracted, its own opposite by a doubling of the 5
Schwarzenegger body that is unaffected. The scream is thus at the same
time the manifestation of the foreign body's uncontainable emotions
and sensations of rage, pain and frustration. They give expression to
the trauma of displacement and the impossibility of fully breaking
down the barrier between host and the foreign body. The Schwarzenegger 10
scream of pain is the articulation of a body stripped of its excess muscle
tissue and meaning. The scream is the Schwarzenegger body made
audible. And this audible body is in stark contrast with the visible body.
It is a body in torment. A body made to scream by the invisible and
in themselves imperceptible forces of exclusion and rejection from the 15
host society.

In its inarticulateness the scream is stripped of those things that
might mark it as lacking articulateness. In this sense, a scream is
unaccented and perceived as having no accent. The scream is catachrestic
in Judith Butler's understanding of catachresis (1993, pp. 27-56):
it breaks language and circumvents those aspects of conventional 20
speech that sustain a phallogocentric, heteronormative, white hegemony.
It is a communication that pre-empts the reflection of perceived
difference back onto the body. The scream is a sound that interpellates
the human community in its totality, not just a specific national or
language community. A scream is the speech organs made audible. It is, 25
as Thompson suggests with Deleuze, not just the sonic event, but
also a series of imperceptible movements that are in themselves
inaudible, which nonetheless sustain the scream (2013, pp. 158-162).
The contracting lungs, the diaphragm, the voice box, the muscles
of the body that tighten and relax in order to generate the sound, 30
and the muscles that pull the mouth wide and open up the eyes and
flare the nostrils are all part of the scream-itself. This scream-itself,
which is inseparably entangled with the affective and affecting
scream, places the screaming foreign body within the community of the 35
living.

10. See my work on the failure of the foreign body to cause things through speech acts 40
(Gergely, 2012a; 2012b). As I argue, with Judith Butler (1993), the power to cause
things to be, that is to say iterative performativity, belongs to one who belongs.

Sonority and Difference: The Exilic Self

In *Listening* (2007), Nancy argues that being and being present is best understood as the relationship between a body that emits and listens to sounds, and the space in which the sounds resonate. These sounds, which are emitted and which resound, are the body's own sounds, but also those of the space in which the body makes sounds, the body's own sounds as they resonate in the space in which the body makes sounds, and also the sounds of the body as they affect the sounds that resonate in that space. "To be listening is [...] to enter into tension and to be on the lookout for a relation to self" (Nancy, 2007, p. 12). That is to say, to be listening is to be alive to a relationship between self and space. To be listening is to be present, Nancy suggests. "This presence is [...] not the position of a being-present [...] it is first of all presence in the sense of *present* that is not a being [...], but rather a *coming* and a *passing*, an *extending* and a *penetrating*" (Nancy, 2007, p. 13). Thus, it is not the being of existing, but rather the being that is a responding to and also a causing of a response. For Nancy, then, "the sonorous present is the result of space-time: it spreads through space, or rather it opens up a space that is its own" (2007, p. 13). Nancy's understanding of sonorous presence as a coming, passing, extending and penetrating helps us make sense of what I have called elsewhere the impossible presence of the foreign other.

I hope to make this point more clearly with reference to the arrival of the T800 in *Terminator*'s opening scene. This scene is the *mise-en-scène* of the Schwarzenegger body's coming into sonorous presence of an inorganic, cyborg self. We are in LA, in 1984, the film's present. A hissing, whining, clanking machine is lifting enormous containers of refuse as an electrical storm brews. Electrical discharges fill the air. The screen goes white. The terrified bin lorry operator bolts from the driver's cabin. The heavy bass of the soundtrack suggests a rhythmic heartbeat that is perhaps not a human rhythm. We see an enormously muscled fully grown man in a crouch. This gigantic newborn stands up, and turns his head as if to scan his surroundings. He walks on soft feet – something that will be contrasted later with the metal clunk of his tread once the organic tissue has been sloughed off – to a spot overlooking the city at his feet. Here too, as throughout the film, the active-passive process of perceiving space is foregrounded.

In this scene, the Schwarzenegger star body materializes in the present and comes into presence. The Terminator is a body that manifests itself here and now, in our space, out of nothing. His emergence from a bolt of lightning without a twitch of muscle marks him not only as not from here, but also as not human. The soundtrack's heartbeat rhythm gives the

The Schwarzenegger Star Body

sequence tension and the T800 some semblance of humanity. At least it implies organic-ness and makes audible an inside that – we soon find out – does not correspond to the actual inside.¹¹ 1

The T800's arrival into the space of the here and now creates a disjointed space, a spatial simultaneity. This two-spaces-at-the-same-time is a being/existing across spaces represented in the film through blinding light that is the white screen. The white screen is an absence that can be understood as the presence of too much matter – a total reflection of light and an impossibility to see; therefore, a zero projection, an absence, and a no-thing. This same-space-twice, which is two-spaces-at-the-same-time, transitions to an image of (light reflected from) the body of a man that is not viable/organic matter. 5 10

It is worth noting that Kyle Reece's (Michael Biehn) arrival is an altogether messier affair. He manifests mid-fall, screaming and flailing. His humanity is underscored by the scream, the thud, the arrival into a space not quite here but above, therefore outside the here. The film implies the trauma of Reece's journey and foregrounds the arrival's impact on his body. By contrast, it denies the trauma of the foreign body's journey and sees his arrival as disruptive only to the space he enters, not to himself. 15 20

If the Schwarzenegger body is an impossible body that ought not to be here (in the context of *Terminator*, a machine-body sent to prevent the being of a human-body) and if the self is produced as a relationship between body and space, then the noise made by the Schwarzenegger body refers to a self that is a machine, and therefore not (fully) a presence, not a sensing body. His voice is an impossible, or at least an unacceptable, sound: noise. If the sounds of a place, the sonorous presence of individuals who imagine themselves as a community that belongs to a space, produce that place, then the disruption of the sounds of a place, i.e. the introduction of noise, is a transformation of that place/space. (*Blade Runner* [Ridley Scott, 1982] is a film that makes effective use of this by differentiating future LA's difference from 1980s LA is expressed through the Japanese sounds of the city. The "wrong" sound of the city displaces it to a new space that is not now.) 25 30 35

11. It also produces tension since we suspect this fully-grown newborn is a body unlinked from human origin. The Schwarzenegger star body is, here, unlinked from the maternal and the organic (Haraway, 2000, p. 292). I have explored this in a conference paper, "The Accented Cinema of Arnold Schwarzenegger", presented at BAFTSS 2016 in Reading. I will return to it in a planned monograph on the Schwarzenegger star body. 40

Film-Philosophy 23 (2019)

The noise the foreign body makes is a sound, then, that expresses a relationship between a displaced self and the space of the host. The sound made and perceived by the displaced self refers to a self that is not a product of the here. But, if interaction with space is a production of space, then the foreign body's sonorous presence produces both an exilic self – that is, a new self – and an exilic space. The exilic self is the name I give to the self that emerges as a relation of self and a new space (the body that ought not to be here); the exilic space is the name I propose for the space produced by the sonorous presence of the foreign other (the place where that body ought not to be).

Nancy argues, “to listen is to enter that spatiality by which at the same time I am penetrated [...] to be listening is to be at the same time outside and inside” (2007, p. 14). He goes on: “the sound that penetrates through the ear propagates through the entire body something of its effects [...] and if we note also that ‘one who emits the sound hears the sound [they emit]’, one emphasizes that animal sonorous emission is necessarily also [...] its own reception” (2007, pp. 14–15). If hearing oneself in space, namely hearing how one sounds, is one of the things by which the animal, the living, is defined, then the Terminator's failure to recognize that he cannot pass as one from LA – his speech is perceived as Austrian and therefore he is seen as foreign – is proof of his failure to listen to himself. Failure to listen to self places him outside the category of the animal. And if accent is a question of mimicry, to think one's accent as sounding from a space one does not “come from” is to hear oneself, to listen to self and perceive self as sounding from here. This is a monumental deception of self, a failure to listen to self.

More broadly speaking, and applying Nancy in more nuanced fashion, Schwarzenegger's films present us with a body whose material presence is in tension with his sonorous presence. A hypermasculine, excessively muscled body, a material presence that is too much, is in tension with a sonorous presence that is muted by its unlinking from the architectural space and from interpersonal communication. A bull in a China shop springs to mind: the proverbial image of a body that is too present in a space which is vulnerable to that presence. This excessive material presence necessarily produces noise: the China breaking, the hooves trampling or, in the metaphor used by *Terminator*, machines trampling on skull-bones. This reconfigures the space of the China shop – the host space – from delicate fragility into collapse and fragmentation. However, the tension deriving from too much presence and too little awareness is further enhanced by the Schwarzenegger body's simultaneous ability to pass undetected – to be neither seen nor heard – and to transform a space through sheer presence. This is a deafness to him/itself, a failure to

The Schwarzenegger Star Body

hear/see oneself properly, and the impossibility of reconciling simultaneously all the positions of the foreign star – the qualities associated with the human actor, the champion bodybuilder, the popular star, the figure of ridicule, the cybernetic organism that is a killing machine and also a machinic protector, the unaffected affective and the affected, etc. It is an absence-yet-presence, a self or subject that is not a sensing self, therefore, in Nancy’s reasoning, it cannot be a subject (2007, p. 8). I have called this an impossible presence, which I suggest characterizes the exilic self.

In sum, the exilic self is a sonorous presence where noise disrupts the coming, passing, extending and penetrating that is listening to self and space. It is a sonorous presence that does not correspond to – is not in harmony with – the material presence. Remember the soundtrack’s heartbeat rhythm when there is no heart. The exilic self’s place of birth is the exilic space: the host space remade as a result of the mutual referral between an exilic body and a host space, that is to say, the sonorous presence of the exilic body.

In conclusion, it seems clear that the Schwarzenegger star body needs closer critical attention because of the apparent simplicity of the meanings bound up in that star body. For, as we have seen, contrary to that apparent simplicity, the Schwarzenegger star body is complexly positioned in contested or transitory spaces. Nancy’s notion of the sonorous presence has helped to theorize how the Schwarzenegger star body’s essential humanity is put under question and, in the *Terminator* franchise, denied outright. This is not to say that the Schwarzenegger star body is unproblematic or should displace bodies with which it shares what Butler calls the unlivable zone beyond the norm (1993, 3). Rather, this article cautions, the Schwarzenegger body should be seen as a body that is subject to violence and disintegration in much the same way that it inflicts violence on other bodies and causes their disintegration as part of a normative exclusionary representational regime. That the Schwarzenegger star body can be both cause and site of traumatic bodily reconfigurations derives from the position of the foreign star simultaneously within the Hollywood economy and beyond the limits of the zone of the norm. Thus, the use of the foreign star is to perform the permeability of the boundary between outside and inside, while also policing it.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge here three significant contributions to this article. Hannah Paveck’s paper at BAFTSS 2017 on sonority in Claire Denis’s *Trouble Every Day* (2001) prompted me to think through the

Film-Philosophy 23 (2019)

presence of the foreign body via Nancy's work on sonority (2007). Marie Thompson, whose work I cite time and again in this article, and Emily Wilczek listened to Schwarzenegger with me and helped me with the analysis of his voice and delivery. I am grateful for their generosity. I am thankful, also, for the generous support and helpful criticism of the reviewers. I am grateful to the copy editor for the careful reading and thorough correction of the text. I owe thanks to Lucy Bolton, and, as ever, to Susan Hayward for invaluable support and comments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Barthes, R. (1989). *Mythologies* (A. Layers, Trans.). London: Paladin.
- Behdad, A. (2005). *A Forgetful Nation: On Immigration and Cultural Identity in the United States*. Durham; London: Duke University Press.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. London: Routledge.
- Deleuze, G. (2003). *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation* (D. W. Smith, Trans.). London: Continuum.
- Deleuze, G, and Guattari, F. (2004). *A Thousand Plateaus* (B. Massumi, Trans.). London: Continuum.
- Dyer, R. (1997). The White Man's Muscles. In *White* (pp. 145–183). London: Routledge.
- Frymus, A. (2018). Jetta Goudal versus the Studio System: Star Labour in 1920s Hollywood. *The Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*. DOI: 10.1080/01439685.2018.1478370.
- Haraway, D. (2000). A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology and Socialist-Feminism in the late Twentieth Century. In D. Bell and B. M. Kennedy (Eds.), *The Cybercultures Reader* (pp. 291–324). London: Routledge.
- Hayward, S. (2004). *Simone Signoret, the Star as Cultural Sign*. London: Continuum.
- Hayward, S. (2005). *French National Cinema*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge.
- Green, L. R. (1997). *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Naficy, H. (2001). *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Nancy, J.-L. (2007). *Listening* (C. Mandell, Trans.). New York: Fordham University Press.
- Negra, D. (2001). *Off-White Hollywood: American Culture and Ethnic Female Stardom*. London: Routledge.
- Nichols, D. (1992). Conan the Republican. *Australian Left Review*, 1(136), 41–42.
- O'Callaghan, C. (2007). *Sounds*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillips, A., and Vincendeau, G. (eds.) (2006). *Journeys of Desire: European Actors in Hollywood: A Critical Companion*. London: BFI.
- Robertson Wojcik, P. (2006). The Sound of Film Acting. *Journal of Film and Video*, 1–2(58), 71–83.
- Thompson, M. (2013). Three Screams. In M. Thompson and I. Biddle (Eds.), *Sound, Music, Affect: Theorizing Sonic Experience* (pp. 147–162). London: Bloombury.
- Thompson, M. (2017). *Beyond Unwanted Sound: Noise, Affect and Aesthetic Moralism*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Verhoeven, J., De Pauw, G., Pettinato, M., Hirson, A., Van Borsel, J., Mariën, P. (2013). Accent Attribution in Speakers with Foreign Accent Syndrome. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 46, 156–68.