

Sara Pinheiro

# “Making Sound for Sound:”

## An Interview with Marie-Jeanne Wyckmans

Marie-Jeanne Wyckmans is a Foley artist and Acousmatic Composer born in Belgium in 1954. She holds a BA in Acousmatic Composition from the Royal Conservatoire of Mons (1993), where she later taught perceptual analysis of sound and image. She also taught Foley and Sound Design at the INSAS (Institut National Supérieur des Arts du Spectacle et des Techniques de Diffusion, Brussels) and at the IAD (Institut des Arts de Diffusion, Louvain-la-Neuve).

Her career as a Foley artist started in the 1970s, in a combination of classic training with natural talent. She speaks about films with ease, in a truly cinephilic stream of consciousness ranging from classics to blockbusters. Wyckmans has worked with nearly all the major directors in Europe (Chantal Akerman, Manoel de Oliveira, Abdellatif Kechiche and Dardenne Brothers, among others) and she speaks onomatopoeically. Very often, she grabs an object to illustrate a sonic gesture. In 1986, Wyckmans was attracted to the poster “The Space of Sound”. She went to the concert and discovered an entire world of acousmatic music through the hands of Annette Vande Gorne and the Musiques & Recherches Association. She then proceeded to combine her talent as a Foley artist with the techniques of acousmatic composition. She has worked with these two crafts ever since.

In 2019, I met Marie-Jeanne Wyckmans during a workshop at the Summer Academy of Electroacoustic Composition, organized by Musiques & Recherches in Ohain. She presented a lecture about Foley, and later on she shared two of her latest compositions with me: *Paysages* (2016) and *L’Hubris du Monde* (2019). These works maintain a sense of fiction that is particular to Foley craft, while conveying classic principles of acousmatic music. And while her works fall into its most classic approach, they carry a strength and a sense of guidance that is very specific to Foley.

Marie-Jeanne Wyckmans has a deep understanding of sound, and yet speaks simply about it. Therefore, her discourse is made of layers and a constant fluctuation among sound’s multiple facets. While her collaboration in a dance project is on hold due to the current health crisis, she has been working on a new composition. She starts with a stereo version and will probably spatialize it later. She claims her works have been a bit dark and she wants to put an end to that. Such darkness derives from her own ideas of contrast and its moving force: it is true contrast and opposites that a dialogue emerges in and makes us (society and sounds alike) move forward.



Marie-Jeanne Wyckmans at work at the studio Genval les Dames (Belgium)

### *How did you become a Foley artist?*

At the age of sixteen, I went to see *Juliet of the Spirits* [Federico Fellini, 1965]. In Belgium, adult content is rated as 16+, so I could finally go see it. I didn't understand anything but I could feel something important was said and then I wanted to know how movies were made.

After high school, I decided to go to the INSAS, a friend of mine had heard about it. In order to prepare myself for the entrance exam, I went for an internship in film editing at the RTB, the Belgium Radio and Television. In this case, the internship was for editing documentaries for television. It was only to give me an idea of how it worked and if I would like it. And I really loved it and registered at the INSAS for film editing. I studied there for three years.

When I was in my second year, one of the teachers invited a Foley artist to demonstrate how he intervened in movies. He showed us an excerpt of a movie by Chantal Akerman, [*I, You, He, She* (1974)]. We, the students, had to reproduce the sequence after him. There was a woman crossing the street and in the middle of the street she stopped to bite an apple and then continued walking. So, we all got an apple, and it was more for fun than to actually do it. Everybody repeated it one after the other. I went last and I succeeded in walking along with the image, I was in sync. When I realized that I was doing it quite well and enjoying it, I thought this profession was appealing to me.

Besides this film excerpt, he showed us many other tricks with the objects from his suitcase. I had a difficult relationship with objects; I would get angry if they wouldn't do what I wanted. I had to master them and that was interesting. He was there for only one day, and at the end of the day I asked him how I could become a Foley-maker. And he said: "You become a Foley-maker by observing one. You need to see how they do it." So, I asked if there were any in Brussels, and he said that there was only one who was from Germany. He told me to go to Paris.

And so, at the end of my second year, I decided to write my thesis on Foley. I had to make a special agreement with the director of the school. I told him I wanted to become a Foley artist and that, in order to write my thesis, I needed to go to Paris. We agreed that I would focus on Foley instead of film editing. In the third year, I went abroad to France and Italy. Back then, there was only one Foley studio in Brussels, and they had their own regular artist, Herr Kramski [*Das Boot* (1981); *The NeverEnding Story* (1984); *Super* (1984)]. The studio was really close to where I lived and I was always passing by to check if they were recording any Foley. The first time I introduced myself to the Foley artist, I told him I wanted to learn the profession and I asked if it could come watch him. He was not much taller than I was and when he first saw me, he said "ah, ah, a woman making Foley... that's not possible!" I asked why, and he said: "because when you make the sound of a punch, you need to hit on your chest." I answered that I was able to do it and showed him. He laughed and said somewhat convinced: "Ah, okay then, ha ha ha."

And thus, every time he came to Brussels, I visited him at the studio. I assisted him for a year. Little by little, he allowed me to do a few sounds. The first time, I was shaking like a leaf. I had to practice a lot by myself. He was really kind to me, knowing there would be another Foley artist in Brussels once I would start professionally, so he wouldn't be requested to come to Belgium anymore. And yet, he showed me everything he knew. This is how I started making Foley. In honor of my first experience with Akerman's film, I called my thesis "I, You, He, She Make(s) Foley".

*And then later on, you worked for Akerman as a Foley artist, right?*

I worked for her for only two and a half days because it was a very quiet movie [*Night and Day*, 1991]. And the most difficult scene had good direct sound anyway. That's the principle of Foley: if the direct sound is good, we keep it. People were not talking, and thus we didn't need to dub it, and we didn't need to make much Foley for it.<sup>1</sup> There is a scene where they destroy

1 Dubbing is a post-production process that consists in replacing the dialogue. It may refer to ADR or it may refer to the "International track". ADR (automated dialogue replacement) is a replacement of the original sound with a re-recording of the dialogue in the studio, usually done in sync with the image. The "international track" consists in the sound of the whole film being *complete* without the dialogues. In other words, the sound of the scene must hold the actions without direct sounds because the lines will be replaced with a different language. In Czech Republic, it is common to dub the films – that is, re-record all the dialogues translated to Czech instead of playing the original foreign audio.

the walls of a room, but really destroy it. That was the most difficult scene and it would have taken a lot of time. I guess it was a bit fake but the sound was good and I didn't need to replace it. Usually, a feature film takes one full week, but there was not a lot happening and people were not moving a lot... so, it only took two and a half days to make the Foley for it.

Sometimes the director comes in because they care about the sound and want to be present. Chantal, for example, was present. She was in Paris, we worked there. And, of course, I worked in Paris as well until 1995, when I had my kid.

*How did your career get started?*

When I started in Belgium, there weren't many film productions. From Wallonia [the French-speaking part of Belgium] and Brussels, it came slowly. Feature films were mainly Flemish. So, when I started, I worked mainly on Flemish movies. For example, with Hugo Claus, Roland Verhaevert, Robbe de Hert and Stijn Coninx. Very interesting directors. They weren't always at the studio because the Foley happens at the same time as music composition and color correction [grading]. Foley happens right before the mixing. It is one of the latest stages in the process and, at that time, the directors usually have a lot to do. But some of them sacrifice their time to be there. Lucas Belvaux is one of them, Marc-Henri Wajnberg is always there also (but I made only one movie with him). It is not common to have everyone there.

In fact, it wasn't a problem to get started. For eight to ten years, I was the only Foley artist on the market, so I can say that I had a monopoly. They would always call me. In the beginning, there wasn't much work in features, but there was a big tendency to make Foley for commercials. And thanks to that I could earn my living quite well. I travelled to Paris, to the Netherlands, to Italy, to Portugal... commercials are made in only one day so I could travel around. There were also many animated movies. It was interesting because I needed to be more creative for animation. The first animation I worked for was *Harpya*, by Raoul Servais [1979]. I don't know why my name isn't credited in it, but I know that I made it. It was my first short animation with a great director, so it was very important for me. The director also appreciated that finally there was a Foley artist in Belgium. Until then, he had been making all the sounds by himself. And we collaborated, because he knew a lot about sounds too and it was the first time for me.

*In the credits of the films you worked on, sometimes it says "sound effects" instead of Foley. Why the difference?*

When it says sound effects, it is more like composing with sounds. It means that I transformed direct sounds from the film. It was sound design without

calling it sound design.<sup>2</sup> For example, in the French movie *Doctor Petiot* [Christan de Chalonge, 1990], the main character, Dr. Petiot (played by Michel Serrault), becomes more and more insane. So, I took the recording of his laugh, and I transformed it in order to make him sound mad. This is how I made some sound effects.

Foley is also a sound effect, but in real time. It is an object that I transform to correspond to the image. For example, when somebody is bleeding or getting punched... These are sound effects because there are bones breaking which is not real. So, it is an “effect” made with Foley. There are some very realistic Foley like clothes, footsteps, doors... These are realistic sounds. But then there are also “Foley effects,” like a punch that breaks a nose, or such things, which are also made in real time, but they are artificial effects.<sup>3</sup>

*You have never wanted to make your own movies?*

No, no, I didn't. I'm not a director.

*Would you say that your compositions are a way of “directing” but with sound?*

Yes, but my images are created through the sound, not through visuals. Ten years after I started making Foley, I discovered acousmatic music and I delved into it. In 1986, I went to the first festival organised by Annette Vande Gorne. I just saw the poster “The Space of Sound” and it directly caught my attention. I liked the title, it was a beautiful idea and I was really curious. A whole world opened up to me that I didn't even know existed. It was also appealing because I was tired of making sound for the screen only. I liked the idea of making sound for sound.

For me, acousmatic starts from the sounds themselves, not from the melodies or so on. I like playing with *corps sonores* [sonic bodies]. It is part of my job to make the objects speak, so to say. In acousmatic practice, we call sonic bodies the objects that produce sound.<sup>4</sup> For example, opening

- 2 The term Sound Design is often attributed to Walter Murch, because he was the first to be designated as such in the final credits of Francis Ford Coppola's *The Rain People* (1969). The term was ultimately popularized later with another Coppola film, *Apocalypse Now* (1979) mostly due to the efforts put towards an aesthetic approach to sound. For a testimony on early sound recording on the set see Michael Ondaatje. *The Conversations: Walter Murch and the Art of Editing Film*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002; or Vincent LoBrutto, *Sound-on-Film: Interviews with Creators of Film Sound*, Westport: Praeger, 1994. However, it is necessary to consider the geographical framing of this terminology. For instance, the films of Jacques Tati were meticulously sound-designed, only the term “sound-design” was not yet in use.
- 3 Establishing the difference between realistic and unrealistic sounds is the most common distinction. However, it is important to note that Foley sounds pertain to those sounds that are performed in the studio, in sync with the image and by maneuvering a prop. In other words, Foley is a technique in itself. Then, within the many layers of sound design, we can refer to Foley sounds as those that seem to belong to the (visual) action: footsteps, cutlery, doors, etc. It doesn't really matter how those sounds were added to the track, if by performance or by using a sound library. It matters mostly how they are perceived in contrast with “effect sounds” – usually called either “stereo sound effects” (sfx) or “mono sound effects” (mfx). These are clearly an artifact, such as a spectacular explosion or threatening thunder.
- 4 Wyckmans is referring to a long tradition of thought in *musique concrète*. The whole concept of “sound object” has been extensively discussed. Recently, there has been an additional transition to the idea





Marie-Jeanne Wyckmans at work at the studio Genval les Dames (Belgium)

a suitcase: the suitcase is an object, and we open it. But in acousmatic sound, a sonic body, a sound source, becomes a sound object once recorded. The suitcase itself isn't the subject anymore, but its recording becomes a sonic material with which we work. So, once the sonic bodies are registered, they become sonic objects; objects of perception. Then we can process the recordings without the manual manipulation of the original sonic body [the suitcase], because the material is now the recording itself [the tape].

On the contrary, Foley is definitely about manipulating sounds with our hands. The sound depends on how I shake, sway or bounce an object that I'm holding in my hands, in real time in front of the screen. It has to match with the image. When somebody punches someone else, it has to correspond with what we see, first if it's the fist or the hand, what force, etc. If someone slams a door, I need to slam a door too. However, the use of the sonic body is different in acousmatics. For example, I will play with the squeaking sounds of the suitcase or a door "eee-oo-eee" like Pierre Henry [in *Variations for A Door and A Sigh*, 1969]. The "object" door doesn't matter to me anymore, what matters is the musical sound it produces and

of "sonorous object," particularly after the translation of Pierre Schaeffer's seminal *Treatise on Musical Objects: An Essay across Disciplines* (University of California Press, 2017). For a shorter assessment, see *Gestural-Sonorous Objects: Embodied Extensions of Schaeffer's Conceptual Apparatus* by Rolf Inge Godøy, *Organised Sound* 11.2 (Aug. 2006):149–157. In this case, Wyckmans alludes to a sonic body as a material object which is the source of a sound, versus a sound object which is the frozen recorded sound, a "closed groove" with a beginning and an end which will then be possible to transform and manipulate.

how I can articulate it. In fact, in either way I make the sounds speak for themselves. The image tells me if I have to make it sound low, loud, angry or not angry.

I once made the sound of somebody walking and wearing a costume made of a bunch of flabby rubber. I had to find a sound which does “prrr-frrr-bloop-bloop-bloop” without sounding artificial. So, I took two rubber objects which were a bit flabby, and I shook them to the rhythm of his gait. All this in real time. And this isn’t musical at all, it is just representative. Actually, it is not even representative; it is embodying the character through sound. It is what Michel Chion calls “rendering.”<sup>5</sup> And even if I don’t use the object that we see on the screen, we believe it is it. I used a rubber boot and a hot water bag, but I manipulated it according to the image: if it moved like this, then I manipulated it this way, if it moved like that, I moved that way. If I used this sound to make music, I would manipulate it thinking of what I could do with it afterwards. For instance, how it would sound when I time-stretched it.

*When we met in Ohain, you would often grab any object around you. You used a piece of fabric, like a kitchen cloth, to make diverse sounds. Just with this, you showed the sound of a train, a heart beating, etc. Do you have favorite objects to work with?*

My suitcase is full of sonic bodies of all sorts, in all sizes. Indeed, some objects show up in every movie, because there are some events or actions that show up in every movie. But sometimes, I have to make it up again. Like with the rubber costume. I watched the movie beforehand and I saw this weird costume. I had absolutely no idea how to make it. I thought that I would find out once at the Foley stage, because I have all my stuff there in front of me. Being there inspires me more than theorizing about it beforehand. If I come across something similar, I will have a base for it already. So, it is a good trick to remember and it is good to remember tricks. I remember my tricks... and there are objects coming back more or less systematically. For instance, a piece of shammy leather can be used to make the sound of bird wings, or to make squeaking windshield wipers from a car when rubbed on glass, or even just to wet my fingers. I also use it to make a “splash.” For example, when there is someone being punched and there is blood spatter, it is a “splash.” So, it is an object I often use. There are also some little objects that can be used to make the sound of squeaking. I have a metal suitcase which squeaks very well.

5 Accordingly, “rendering would involve ‘transliterating’ tactile sensations into auditory sensations.” See Michel Chion. *Audio-Vision: Sound on Screen*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994, p. 112.



*When you watch a movie, do you pay attention to the Foley in particular?*

When I watch a movie to make the Foley for it, I only pay attention to what I need to do – not to the story. I take notes of the actions and of the objects I will need to use. It is completely strategic. When I watch a movie for leisure, I don't care about any of this... unless I get bored. Then, I'll ask myself if Foley is good.

Sometimes some of the sounds in the movie catch my attention. We perceive a lot more through sound than what we recognize. Things that we don't notice but that are there. When we see a movie for the first time, we sense it. Actually, one of the important lessons of Michel Chion is to ask what is visible from what we hear? Do I hear what I see? This is the core of film-sound analysis.

Michel Chion doesn't watch a movie, he listens to it. Hence, he heads directly for the essence. He observes what a movie really is saying. This is what I believe. I know it since there was a time when we would watch movies together and he would say: "Did you hear that? The car starting when he came out of the pub?" And I would say "no, no, I didn't." I saw the car starting but I didn't hear the sound of it. He was listening to the movie, while I was watching it. So, during the second go I would listen to it. When I was teaching, I would always watch a movie rather twice. The first time, to see it globally and to get an overall impression. To get into it, into the story and into what interests me. And the second time, I would watch in more detail. It is then that I listen. That is the difference between watching a movie for recreational purposes or to analyze it. At least that is how it works for me; I listen to the movie (and pay attention to the sound) when I have to analyze it.

*Is there a film you like the sound of in particular?*

For me, *2001: A Space Odyssey* [Stanley Kubrick, 1968] has one of the most impressive sound designs. It is full of silences. It contains very few sounds, and only those fill the image completely. *Once Upon a Time in the West* [Sergio Leone, 1968] is also very beautiful.

There are also many new technologies, like Dolby Atmos.<sup>6</sup> *Gravity* [Alfonso Cuarón, 2013] was the first movie played on Atmos in Belgium. It was happening *in* the space and the music was moving around the loudspeakers. We were really immersed in it. It's a very good blockbuster. Notice that when we make acousmatic music, we are used to many loudspeakers. In

6 Dolby Atmos is a surround technology developed by Dolby Laboratories. It consists of the traditional multichannel system (5.1 or 7.1) with an additional layer of raised loudspeakers. In a way, the sound becomes three-dimensional.

cinema, the problem is that the loudspeakers are in a fixed position. A certain category of sound [dialogue, Foley, effects, etc] will always be assigned to a specific channel. But on Dolby Atmos, the sound can really move. It makes the sound rotate.

*Do you think these technologies change the way we listen to film?*

I don't watch movies on the computer, for example. I rather watch TV series because they are meant for a small screen and can be seen almost on a [smart] watch. It doesn't bother me, because as soon as I put on my headphones, I'm into it. If I listen without headphones, on the laptop loudspeakers, it's too disconnected. Still, I can engage with the image easily because it consists mainly of close-up shots. But a movie is not meant to be watched on a small screen. A television screen can be big enough, especially if in a dark room and with a proper stereo system. Some people even have four channels or 5.1 at home, but I am already satisfied with a stereo system... I feel close to the image. And that is the point, getting closer to the image. Now, I can't get into Tarkovsky's image like this. For these great scenarios, we need cinema, a large screen.

For this reason, I think all technologies will remain. Nothing is disappearing, something is just less common. Maybe there will be less productions, but also less of the bad ones... Those which resist the change will be worth watching. We will see what kind of movies will be produced. A James Bond in the cinema is actually worth it, but it is nonsense on a tablet. I think change is important, and in the end, nothing replaces the experience of the screening hall.

When I am working, it is a different story. If I do it in front of a television screen, even if it is a big television screen, it is not the same as when I am standing in front of a large screen. I need to be able to turn my head from one side to the other side of the screen. If I am at the cinema, it is almost a 180° vision. So, I need to be in a 180° situation to make the Foley. I need to see the micro details. It is not replaceable.

*Making sounds also remains the same?*

I had to practice a lot at home to be in sync with the image. At that time, synchronicity was much more difficult. Synchronicity is still very difficult, anyhow. But back then, we had magnetic tapes so we really had to be in sync. In the beginning, there were two tracks on the same tape and we were running from one track to the other. We couldn't cut to re-synchronize. If it was a bit late, it was not possible to cut because we would cut the other sounds together in the other track. So, we had to be very precise. Then the digital arrived and other challenges arrived as well.



Marie-Jeanne Wyckmans and Marina Lerch at work at the studio Genval les Dames (Belgium)

When I started working, it was a bit like with old photo cameras. The image was beautiful but it didn't have great definition. That's the major difference, so we had to be more precise. Nowadays, sound is as high-resolution as the image. The new technologies allow us to work in detail, and with multiple tracks of course. For example, back then, we focused on the foregrounds. Eventually, if we had time, we would do the backgrounds. Nowadays, we cover everything; from the background to the foreground of the image.

A sound can be composed in several layers. I don't make a punch in one track. I make one layer with the lows, one with the mediums, and one with the highs. I will make the highs with my skin, the mediums with the shammy leather and the lows by hitting in a pillow. So, there are three layers more or less together.

That is the difference... Today we can compose one sound with more sounds. In fact, we decompose the sounds. We want to create a beautiful sonic-image, so we decompose its layers. Commercials had a big influence in this, because they zoom into things and therefore we needed to be much more detailed. I think the sonic-image is more beautiful today because it is more resolute, like the visual-image.

*Your acousmatic compositions are in fact very high-resolution. In your composition L'hubris du Monde, you also mention a certain political perspective. The program note says: "The human world and the planet are ransacked by our excessiveness (hubris in Latin). The*

*Planet, facing our unquenchable greed. (...) Humans forget quickly. (...) One step forward, Two steps back. Will a further step forward still be possible? I hear the society of men and nature screaming their pains and their limits. Hubris of the World is the revolted expression of this current state of affairs.” How do your sounds address your political position in your compositions?*<sup>7</sup>

Somehow, my sound choices reflect my present feeling. In *L'Hubris* it is the anger, the overload, the excess. I chose this title while listening to the sounds I was working on. Once I have the title of a piece, I know how to go on with it. In this case the very low-frequency sounds, very dark, gushing, led me to say “we are in anger.” I took these sounds because they were appealing to me at that moment, so the sounds guided me.

My artistic or creative approach starts from the sounds. I work on them and they lead me to an idea. They reflect my state of mind and my feelings but I don't overthink it. If the world makes me angry, it is expressed in my sounds. But I'm not trying to say something in particular, except what I tell myself while working. And that inspires me toward a certain idea. This is how I proceed. Other people work completely differently. They either start from an idea, or from a concrete concept, or something else more formal. I work more on the form. For me, the title is the idea. And I get the idea from the sounds.

I'm currently working on something dark again, but after that I think I will stop because there is too much darkness. It is a similar sound to *L'hubris*... The title changes all the time but the style remains. It is something like an “Everyday Nightmare”. By nightmare, I mean that there are things moving in the dark and I mix them together. In the beginning, it was only dark and I thought of using sounds that are a bit brighter. So, I was working between two extremes, which I tried to join. Once I manage, it will not be called a nightmare anymore. But for now, it is still a nightmare.

I think I am just adding darkness to more darkness at the moment. Maybe my state of mind is reflected in it but it is not my main concern. I'm concerned if it is listenable. If it is pleasant to the ears and good. In fact, I started from a very simple sound, a 1000Hz tone... but I transformed it so much that it became completely dark. It also depends on the tools I use. In this case, it is indeed a matter of technology, it inevitably directs the sounds. I record all these transformations, and then I pick the interesting ones.

This is how I start. It is somewhat random, until the idea starts shaping itself. For *L'hubris*, I used a lot of sounds of waves, water.... Then I transformed

<sup>7</sup> This composition [accessed 24-03-2021] is available at:  
<https://soundcloud.com/influx-acousmatic/marie-jeanne-wyckmans-lhubris-du-monde>

them or multiplied them into different textures. Some textures inspired me, some didn't. This is my workflow. Usually, the first transformation is to slow down or to speed up the sound. It is absolutely basic but highly effective. I find it beautiful. It also reveals a completely different sound which has nothing to do with the original anymore. I'm interested in the contrasts of sounds, like black or white; dark and thick or light and ethereal. I made some of the sounds a very long time ago, but I use them again. I also make new sounds, but, for example, the bright sound in this nightmare is twenty years old. I know it very well. Yet, I need to find a way to introduce it into the composition.

I believe contrast enables dialogue. Through opposition, we find difference. It creates junctions and allows for divergence. Contrast generates a dis-course of diversity. It moves us forward. It is the essence of freedom.

Translated by Donia Jourabchi

Marie-Jeanne Wyckmans

Selected filmography as Foley artist and sound effects:

*Il était un petit navire* (dir.: Marion Hänsel, 2019), *Keeper* (dir.: Guillaume Senez, 2015), *The Praying Mantis* (dir.: Marc Levie, 2014), *Blue is the Warmest Colour* (dir.: Abdellatif Kechiche, 2013), *Me, Myself and Mum* (dir.: Guillaume Gallienne, 2013), *Nostalgia for the Light* (dir.: Patricio Guzmán, 2010), *The Year of Getting to Know Us* (dir.: Patrick Sisam, 2008), *The Intruder* (dir.: Frank van Mechelen, 2005), *The Cage* (dir.: Alain Raoust, 2002), *The Son* (dir.: Jean-Pierre and Luc Dardenne, 2002), *Soul Assassin* (dir.: Laurence Malkin, 2001), *Le temps perdu* (dir.: Frédéric Roullier-Gall, 2001), *The Milk of Human Kindness* (dir.: Dominique Cabrera, 2001), *Identity Pieces* (dir.: Mwezé Ngangura, 1998), *The Stowaway* (dir.: Ben van Lieshout, 1997), *Mrs. Dalloway* (dir.: Marleen Gorris, 1997), *A Caixa* (dir.: Manoel de Oliveira, 1994), *A Mirage* (dir.: Marc Levie, 1993), *Normal People Are Nothing Exceptional* (dir.: Laurence Ferreira Barbosa, 1993), *Abraham's Valley* (dir.: Manoel de Oliveira, 1993), *Night and Day* (dir.: Chantal Akerman, 1991), *Skin* (dir.: Guido Henderickx, 1987), *The Lost Way* (dir.: Patricia Moraz, 1980)

Compositions:

*Fin de crise* (2021), *Ce qu'entend le noyé* (2020), *L'hubris du Monde* (2020), *Voyage-Mirages* (2018), *Le Parti Flou des Sons* (2017), *Paysages* (2016), *Voyage, voyage* (video clip, 2005), *Mouvements Browniens* (2005), *Trajets* (2005), *Appels* (1991), *Tableau* (1991), *La Terre et le Ciel* (1990), *Envols I* (1988), *Alchimie* (1988), *L'absence du Vide* (1987)