Mikołaj Marks
Uniwersytet Gdański

Marek Mosakowski
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5154-7650
Uniwersytet Gdański

Out of the past (1947) – the question of truth in Jacques Tourneur's noir movie

Człowiek z przeszłością (1947) – problematyka prawdy w filmie noir Jacques'a Tourneura

Abstract

Noir creators of the 1940s, like Jacques Tourneur, had a specific way of presenting worlds behind the silver screen. Their movies were visibly different than everything else Hollywood had to offer at that time. Marked by dark colors, inhabited by gritty, lost individuals, noir worlds seem hostile yet they also attract the audience in a perverse manner. Moreover, noir creators defy truth as it is. To discover it a person has to become an investigator, and study the noir movie like a murder case. Every element of the puzzle counts, as the film's purpose is to deceive the audience. Analyzing both outside, mimetic tools of the filmmaker and inside, diegetic elements incorporated in a story-world is vital to understand how noir successfully plays with the idea of truth.

Streszczenie

Twórcy noir lat czterdziestych ubiegłego wieku, jak Jacques Tourneur, mieli szczególny sposób przedstawiania światów za srebrnym ekranem. Ich filmy wyraźnie róż-

niły się od tego, co Hollywood miało do zaoferowania w tamtym czasie. Nacechowane ciemnymi kolorami, zamieszkane przez zdeterminowanych, zagubionych osobników, światy noir wydają się wrogie, jednak zarazem w perwersyjny sposób przyciągają widownię. Co więcej, twórcy noir przeciwstawiają się prawdzie. Aby ją odkryć, widz musi stać się śledczym i studiować film noir jak sprawę o morderstwo. Liczy się każdy element układanki, ponieważ celem filmu jest oszukanie widza. Analiza zewnętrznych, mimetycznych środków, jak i wewnętrznych, diegetycznych elementów zawartych w świecie przedstawionym jest kluczowe do zrozumienia jak noir gra z ideą prawdy, odnosząc sukces.

Jean-Marie Schaeffer in his seminal work entitled *Pourquoi la fiction?* (Why fiction?) argues that fiction is much more than just an infinite playground for the human imagination. In fact, it is deeply rooted in the most primal need for imitation, prevalent not only in human beings, but in practically all animal species as well[1]. In consequence, fiction as an inherent element of human condition came to be the principal theme of all literary and esthetic theories. Plato, Aristotle, Boileau, Coleridge and most recently Foucault or Derrida are just a few selected names in the otherwise interminable list of thinkers who dedicated their philosophical reflection to the intricacies of fiction and mimesis. The Romantics, for example, brought the problem of imitation to an even more consequential level by claiming that to create fiction was equal to becoming a God[2]. But forming a fictional world implies an art of description. Here fiction and reality coincide, since the real world, just like its fictional counterpart, is also based on descriptions. Certain word describes a certain object. A chair is a chair because it is named, and surely described as such. Settled definitions help to comprehend, understand and precisely delimitate the surrounding, material phenomenon people call reality. The core of understandable matter or inter-subjective experiences has to remain stable in order for humans not to go insane and as such it constitutes the essence of practical truth. The truth simply is – claims Aristotle – and denying it undermines common sense[3]. Yet various thinkers had eagerly tackled the very idea of truth so conceptualized and going against classic Aristotelian definition often came up with elaborate explanations that the truth actually does not exist. The credit for this goes mostly to postmodern philosophers like Foucault and Lyotard, who based their reflection on Nietzsche's famous statement

---

[1] J.-M. Schaeffer, *Pourquoi la fiction?*, Paris 1999, p. 7–19.

[2] D. Jenson, *Trauma and its Representations*, Baltimore 2001, p. 17.

[3] Ch.M. Olfert, *Aristotle on Practical Truth*, Oxford 2017, p. 23–26.

that there are no facts, only interpretations[4]. Thus from the perspective of post-modern thought the whole material and inter-subjective reality is no more than just a fiction – illusive, impenetrable and multifarious. An infinite constellation of all potentialities[5]. The explanation of mysteries underlying such labyrithine reality resembles a never-ending quest, an Oedipal endeavor to find an impossible answer to the question of one's own obscure origins. Let us take for example the crime fiction; the detective – an Oedipal figure *par excellence* – is, just like the hero of the famous Greek tragedy, after the truth. Whodunnit? There was a murder, and it is a fact, but no one knows the whole truth. People love to be deceived but only if they know that the truth exists, somewhere out there, under the deep mud, dirt, thick fog, clotted blood, or behind the wall of heavy rain or blurred cigarette smoke. In order to engage audience in such convoluted search for truth the creators of criminal stories, which for the purpose of this article we shall refer to as the noir genre, use various tools of deception, which only careful investigation can uncover.

As far as the noir genre is concerned, critics cannot achieve a consensus on what are characteristics of noir that can apply to all of noir creations. For this genre itself seems to be a hybrid, but the one so distinctive that everybody easily recognizes it as such. What assuredly marks each of these works of art is a sense of anxiety, ambivalence, uncanniness and surrounding ontological as well as narrative corruption. There is always a tormented, lost protagonist, man or woman, who has to face the unfamiliar reality and deal with its intricate, labyrinthine nature in quest for an ever-elusive evidence of truth.

In this article we shall closely examine a movie by Jacques Tourneur from 1947 entitled *Out of The Past*, a transparent representative of the noir genre. The more so that the movie is a model example of a classic narrative formula depicting an old date mob and mafia boss. This motion picture, made in the golden era of noir films, the times of Humphrey Bogart and Rita Hayworth, provides most familiar, yet at the same time extremely mysterious and confusing tropes. In the world of hardboiled detectives and dangerous femmes fatales nothing is what it seems to be and assuredly nothing cannot be taken at its face value. So we shall examine several scenes from the movie and discuss what techniques are used by its creators to deliberately hide the truth from the viewers, thus engaging them in the process of a highly disconcerting, quasi Oedipal quest.

---

[4] M.P. Markowski, *Nietzsche. Filozofia interpretacji*, Kraków 2001, s. 22–23.
[5] A. Burzyńska, M.P. Markowski, *Teorie literatury XX wieku. Podręcznik*, Kraków 2006, p. 326–334.

When the criminal investigation begins in the film the suspect is located in a dark alley, in the back of a dream factory, among shady bars and dives, under the banners of 1940s American noir fiction. At the first glance the truth in the story is invisible because of the clouds of smoke, coming out of the multiple cigarettes smoked by almost every character of the movie, especially the protagonist, detective Jeff Markham (Robert Mitchum). Thus the audience receives a peculiar window to another world, which is uncanny and deceptive. There is a metaphorical wall, a glass between our world and the movie world. The noir creators, however, have plenty of tricks to immerse the spectator without destroying this wall; therefore the two distinct realms do not collide and a viewer seems to be safe and sound in a cozy chair, in front of a screen, while still being played with and somewhat baffled.

The Jacques Tourneur's film welcomes the audience with its unfamiliar grey colors. Although movies in color existed at the time, classic noir's most recognizable feature was black and white format. Andrew Spicer writes in his *Historical Dictionary of Film Noir* that "Tourneur's style is suggestive and understated, drawn to complex, ambiguous stories that reflect the protagonists' own doubts about their motivations, and even their identities"[6]. Another critic of the noir genre, Michael F. Kearney, argues in the preface to his *Film Noir Guide* that the element which interested the film viewers the most at that time was naturally crime, but not cold-blooded, 1930s gangster cinema kind of crime[7]. The characters in noir were much more human, down-to-earth and, therefore, relatable to and yet, at the same time, they were criminals: "Watching these film noir characters was like secretly watching neighbors or friends indulging in illegal and immoral behavior. What could be more exciting and provocative than that?"[8].

The individual that *Out of the Past* lets the audience secretly peek at is precisely Jeff Markham (Robert Mitchum). Mitchum often played simple men with inherent charm and striking charisma. The author of *Film Noir Guide* underlines that "when casting directors needed someone who could play a handsome but gullible sucker for a dame (...) they always check[ed] first to see if Bob Mitchum was available.[9]" The character of Jeff Markham is a focalizer in the majority of the movie, so the audience accompanies him throughout the whole story. However,

---

[6] A. Spicer, *Historical Dictionary of Film Noir*, Lanham 2010, p. 304.
[7] M.F. Kearney, *Film Noir Guide*, Stradford 2003, p. 3.
[8] Ibidem.
[9] Ibidem, p. 19.

before he appears on the screen, the viewer is thrown into the middle of nowhere – in itself a highly significant element of the uncanny narrative – exactly 349 miles from Los Angeles.

The movie opens with a magnificent landscape accompanied by elevated film music. The views are gorgeous, not to say sublime, yet as they change the viewer can get the vibe that he/she has been taken into the perplexing wilderness, far away from civilization and its predictable, familiar structures. Later the music tones down, the camera shows crossroads in plain fields and then the sleepy town called Bridgeport. Noir grapples audiences with a hook in the form of the unknown, hidden truth, and to lure them further into the story it feeds people with scraps of information. *Out of the Past* uses the advantage of the visuals and shows the back of a man's head, in black hat, driving into town and stopping by the gas station with a big sign which says "Jeff Bailey".

The whole noir and later neo-noir genre is transmedial in its pursuit to hide the truth, and every next medium used to serve this purpose is usually more intermedial than the previous one. The movie uses three media: visuals, sound, and language/script. A typical motion picture naturally lacks the interactive aspect. There are already plenty of examples of breaking the fourth wall in mainstream cinema/television (*House of Cards* 2013, *Deadpool* 2016) but these creations also cannot be called "interactive" because the audience cannot respond. Recent project by Netflix entitled *Black Mirror: Bandersnatch* (2018) claims to be an interactive movie; yet can it still be called a movie at this point? It is a clever project which highlights the elusiveness of free will, playing with the concepts of making a choice, film, and videogame. In 1947, however, the creators of noir had cinematic devices only. To emphasize the general elusiveness of the world and human interactions they used various camera angles, different tones of music, and complex scripts. They were aware of their possibilities which were different, and often greater than the ones of the written novel, because "thanks to their technological objectivity, photos and movies offer a much more convincing testimony of the objects or events they represent than images created by the human hand, or even verbal descriptions[10]." The creators of a noir movie propose an insight to another world; so does every other kind of storytelling, and like every other non-interactive media they take the audience by the hand and show them only what they want people to see. The claim that "the spectator does not pretend to be a flesh-and-blood observer located on the scene, but rather sees himself as

---

[10] M.-L. Ryan, M. Grishakova. *Intermediality and Storytelling*, Berlin–New York 2010, p. 16.

disembodied consciousness that moves around the fictional world as freely as the camera"[11] is correct, because audience is behind the wall, in another world, but the camera does not move freely, it is governed by the creators of the film.

The man in black lights up a cigarette and asks a question "Where is Bailey?"[12] confirming by that the significance of the wide camera angle which caught Jeff Bailey's name on the gas station. A silent investigator, the viewer, feels pretty much in the dark or is left confused out on the street of a little town. The man who is presented at first is Joe Stefanos, a gangster goon portrayed by Paul Valentine. He seems suspicious from the beginning, but it is he, the mobster with a smirk, whom the audience follow until the principal protagonist finally appears. The man Joe asks for Bailey is a deaf kid, someone who cannot respond to a question and subsequently to state the truth in speech, which only constitutes another evidence for inter-subjective incommensurability of the minds. The fact that Stefanos has to wait for Bailey to come back creates tension, and the camera does not hurry, when the goon slowly walks to Marny's café, opposite the gas station. In this place Marny gossips with the local decent-guy Jimmy, while Joe waits to order his coffee. In noir nobody gives any information on a silver plate. The messages are often short and cynical. The appropriate, most simple word to describe Joe's response in the dialog between him and Marny seems to be "cheeky", if not "provocative":

> *Marny: What'll you have?*
> *Joe: Coffee*
> *Marny: Nothing else?*
> *Joe: Cream*[13].

After Jimmy leaves the coffee house, the director exposes noir's attitude to the truth in Marny's words: "Everything people ought to know they just don't want to hear[14]." This line implicates that people avoid the truth in general. The statement often applies to the subjective truth of one person's feelings. In this case Marny teased Jimmy about Bailey taking his girl, named Ann Miller. Everybody, however, crave to find out what actually happened, crave for the physical, objective, tangible truth. Ideally, courts are institutions which exist to reveal such truth. But in fact, people are usually satisfied when they just get the answer they

---

[11] Ibidem, p. 18.
[12] J. Tourneur, *Out of the Past*, RKO Pictures 1947, (00:01:54–58).
[13] Ibidem, (00:03:38–42).
[14] Ibidem, (00:04:03–06).

can believe in, not necessarily the true one. Noir understands this complexity, and fittingly it gives the audience a strong, silent type for a main character. The responsibility of an actor who portrays such a hero is demanding, because of the inner conflicts he suppresses. Spicer claims that in *Out of the Past* "it is Mitchum who carries the film, conveying a complex character: intelligent, skeptical, and engaging but also passive, enveloped in coruscating fatalism that can only comment on his actions, never alter them[15]." Later in the movie, Jeff confronts Joe, and it turns out that Stefanos found his old acquaintance by accident. Harmful, bad luck also marks the noir stories, just as it marked ancient tragedies, where the protagonists were doomed from the very beginning. Blind fate is the vital part of any noir story, because it is what the worn-out, troubled individuals involved in it deserve. They fulfill themselves when fate catches up with them.

Through the first ten minutes of *Out of the Past*, Tourneur, who cleverly controls our window to the world of Jeff, Marny and Joe Stefanos, lets us see very little. He keeps the window immensely dirty, and covered with roller-blinds. After seeing the couple of opening scenes, only suspicion emerges. The meaningful events are briefly indicated by a side character, additionally a questionable one – a goon at the command of a mobster. Further into the film, Jeff takes control of the window, and becomes a first-person narrator. He cleans it in some places, and lifts the roller-blinds a little bit. Actually, Jeff brings Ann Miller, a local girl, on a ride to lake Tahoe where he is supposed to meet Joe Stefanos and his former boss Whit Sterling (Kirk Douglas). We, the audience are in the same position as Ann Miller – which is of a careful, attentive listener. The choice to give the narration to the protagonist who deals with the past is typical of noir: "Film noir's distinctive patterning derives from its depiction of protagonists dominated by their past, particularly, how past actions determine the present and the future"[16]. The title of the movie *Out of the Past* already suggests that the answers are in the past. The Polish translation of this title, *Człowiek z przeszłością*, even specifies that the film is about the past of the protagonist. The characters of noir creation are most often people with emotional baggage, and their past is the key, but the key presented in blurry retrospections, tales of unreliable narrators or dream sequences. These atypical kinds of narration were "a radical departure from classical Hollywood's conventional mode of storytelling, with its omniscient, smoothly flowing linear narrative in which each action leads swiftly and logically

---

[15] A. Spicer, op.cit., p. 227.
[16] Ibidem, p. 212.

on to the next and where all the loose ends are tied up, as opposed to noir's often ambiguous or inconclusive endings"[17]. Noir creators, including Jacques Tourneur, not only do not show the audience the truth from an omniscient point of view, but they also introduce unreliable narrators who recount their often incoherent memories, which are supposed to be the bases or keys to understand the present events. Everything here is disintegrated, shattered and blurred. In conclusion, the audience cannot be sure of anything presented in the noir fiction manner. According to Spicer, "the stabilities of a linear chronology are often undermined and time becomes discontinuous and fragmented. Hence the narrative devices that attempt to render this discontinuity – voice-overs, multiple narrators, flashbacks, dream sequences depicting subjective states. These are all striking features of film noir"[18]. In *Out of the Past* the viewer is left with the choice to believe what Jeff is telling or to stay distant and skeptical towards anything happening on the screen during his tale. The classical mimetic device of suspending the disbelief is evidently absent in Tourneur's movie.

The character played by Mitchum starts with stating his real name: Jeff Markham. That behavior can mean two things: one, he is finally dead honest with the woman he loves, Ann Miller, or two, he is a notorious liar, who hides even his identity. The audience, of course, chooses option one, because it is easier to enjoy the movie that way, and Robert Mitchum simply cannot play an evil cheat in the 1940s (he does however play a maniac later in his career, in *Cape Fear* 1962). That was just not possible, considering the noir trope associated with him, the one of a tired and disillusioned but also decent and calm detective.

Jeff Markham lights a cigarette and starts telling his past to Ann Miller, and to the audience. From this point, the twelfth minute of the movie, up to the fortieth minute, the hard-boiled detective presents the events which had led to the present turmoil with Whit Sterling. The casting is remarkable in *Out of the Past*, because every actor fits perfectly his/her role. The audience gives the credit of trust to Jeff, yet we can imagine that Ann Miller hears only his voice, while the audience is given a literal insight into the past with Jeff's voice-over. First the detective recalls being given a job of finding Kathie Moffat (Jane Greer), by Kirk Douglas' character, and the actor is "superb as Whit, cruel and vindictive but also inveigling and fearful"[19]. The next half hour of the movie narrated by Jeff is not only a simple discovery of the past events, but also a discovery of Jeff's true feel-

---

[17] Ibidem, pp. 212–213.
[18] Ibidem, p. 212.
[19] Ibidem, p. 227.

ings, expressed in his narration. Jeff's hard-boiled monologue exposes plenty of the detective's inner feelings, as in a melodramatic narration[20].

Jeff's tale is saturated with emotions, which makes it all the more difficult to find the actual truth of how the events occurred. Moreover, it is a fact that his voice-over imparts an undeniable, gritty, noir feel to the movie. Jeff is a good detective; he knows how to read people and divide their answers into true and false. He detects that the woman he asks about his job, that is the whereabouts of Kathie Moffat (Jane Greer), is lying, and instead of Florida she goes to Mexico. The position of a detective is crucial in evaluating truth in noir fiction. We trust that the detective will find out the truth, get to the bottom of things. Characters like Jeff show that it is a heavy burden to be a detective. They are sour and aware, and this results in some of the greatest one-liners of all time. For example, when Jeff leaves his partner Fisher, and later ventures to Mexico, he sums up his trip with a few lines: "You don't get vaccinated for Florida, but you do for Mexico. So I just followed that 90 pounds of excess baggage to Mexico City. She had been at the Reforma and then gone. I took the bus south like she did. It was hot in Taxco. You say to yourself, 'How hot can it get?' And then in Acapulco, you find out"[21].

Getting back to the main theme of this article – the question concerning the elusiveness of truth – let's sum up the facts of the story. At first, the movie lacks a voice-over and the audience gets acquainted with detective Jeff Bailey/ Markham. The second part of the movie is Jeff's story, which seems to be a relation of factual events, with Mitchum's character's voice-over, which provides only Jeff's feelings and does not change the storyline shown in flashback. The flashback serves as a means to make sense of the present events. Whit gives Jeff a new job, and sends him to San Francisco to meet a man name Eels. Jeff Markham is a detective, so he is supposed to dig up the truth. But as the audience follows the protagonist, the complications only multiply, and every new character seems to hide or obscure the truth. The most important element of the carefully built construction, which renders the truth invisible in *Out of the Past*, is the character of the femme fatale. Spicer writes that "the figure of the deadly female – the femme fatale or the spider woman – is the most conspicuous representation of femininity in film noir"[22]. Further, Spicer observes that the deadly woman in noir can be "overpoweringly desirable, a symptom of male anxieties, a creature

---

[20] R. Miklitsch, *Siren City: Sound and Source Music in Classic American Noir*, New Brunswick--Rutgers 2011, p. 55.

[21] *Out of the Past*, (00:16:36–56).

[22] A. Spicer, op.cit., p. 329.

who threatens to castrate and devour her male victim"[23] and intelligent, resourceful or ruthless[24]. Kathie Moffat (Jane Greer) embodies all of that. A dreamlike sequence in the La Mar Azul bar is shot in a specific manner, to introduce the dangerous woman. This is the achievement of Nicholas Musuraca, the photographer who modulates light to provide dreamlike quality[25]. The way of depicting the femme fatale, in a script, the looks, and how Kathie Moffat is filmed, indicate her inherent duality, but do not show it off. She is designed not only to fool Jeff, but also the audience. The movie introduces plenty of schemers (Whit Sterling, Jeff's partner Fisher, and even the good Jimmy from Bridgeport); yet it is Kathie Moffat's scheme that is the most twisted. Everyone has a stake in the game, but only Kathie always keeps her cards to herself. The truth is a box of toys for Kathie Moffat, and she uses it to play with men throughout the movie. As well as with the baffled audience.

The noir creators control our window onto their fictional worlds. They play with the camera, introduce flashbacks essential to understand the whole film, produce a complicated story and add appropriate music, yet what is their most powerful means is an actual person inhabiting the story world, with the most unclear motives, the femme fatale, Kathie Moffat. Of course she is a part of the script, yet somehow she appears to exist outside of it. The visuals and sound help to present and emphasize her beauty, but the viewer can only grasp the part of it. Even if the audience hears Jeff's voice-over, it is Kathie Moffat who controls the narrative on her own terms. She plays different characters to control Whit and Jeff. She murders Jack Fisher, tries to frame Jeff for the murder of Eels, the man with documents aggravating Whit, uses Sterling himself, and finally she murders the big mobster. In the end of the movie, standing above Whit Sterling's warm body, Moffat puts her cards on the table, and Jeff understands that he is doomed. He had been trapped in an illusion formed by a femme fatale so long that it has become his reality. In the final scenes Jeff and Kathie exchange a few truth-unveiling lines:

Jeff: You're running the show now?
Kathie: Do you mind Jeff."[26]

---

[23] Ibidem, p. 329.
[24] Ibidem.
[25] Ibidem, p. 228.
[26] *Out of the Past*, (01:29:18–27).

And further:

> *Kathie: I never told you I was anything but what I am. You just wanted to ima-*
> *gine I was. That's why I left you. Now we're back to stay.*
> *Jeff: And I have nothing to say about it?*
> *Kathie: Well, have you? Whit's dead. A bundle of papers isn't any good. If Joe*
> *was around, you could use him, but Joe's dead too. So, what are you gonna do*
> *about Eels and Fisher? For that matter what you gonna do about this [Whit's*
> *murder]? Someone has to take a blame*[27].

Kathie controls the situation and blackmails Jeff, to which he answers in a typi-cal, hard-boiled manner: "Well, build my gallows high, baby"[28]. The movie proves that in noir the bare truth does not matter, and if it is used at all, than it is used as a tool. When the so-called bare truth comes out, the film has to end, and char-acters like hard-boiled detective Jeff Markham or deadly femme fatale Kathie Moffat cannot exist any longer. Eventually Jeff uses Kathie's weapon and deceives her. Both characters are tragic because they had to die, when the illusion is lifted. Both of them are gunned down in a police ambush that ends the storyline formed by the lies of Kathie Moffat.

The main characters are dead, yet this outcome is too simple for an ending of a noir story. It is too obvious; in fact, it states the truth as it is. The bloody wounds, crashed car and lifeless bodies of the hard-boiled detective and femme fatale are too true. Noir chooses to present lie and illusion over the truth anytime. The last scene focuses on Ann Miller, Jimmy, and a young, deaf friend of Jeff. The decent guy of Bridgeport, Jim, is happy because he thinks he has ended up with his dream girl. Ann, however, turns away from him and walks to the deaf kid at the gas station, and as he was Jeff's friend, she asks if Bailey was running away with Kathie Moffat when he died. Ann loves Jeff and cannot get over his loss. The kid looks her in the eyes and answers with a confirming nod. He knew Jeff well enough to know that he loved Ann too, but he lies to her anyway. Ann leaves, the kid smiles towards the "Jeff Bailey" banner and walks away. This ends the movie. The final lie gives a closure to Ann; only a lie can bring her peace. The kid knows that Jeff would like him not to state the truth to Ann, so that she could continue living her life, without grieving the late detective.

The analysis of *Out of the Past* demonstrates that classic film noir, the proto-plast of the noir genre, uses various moviemaking techniques to show people that

---

[27] Ibidem, (01:29:37–01:30:03).
[28] Ibidem, (01:30:15).

the old Aristotelian definition of truth is never enough. Although the noir accepts the existence of truth, yet it sees it as a toy or an obscure playground where all possible interpretations of the elusive reality intermix. The embodiment of noir's attitude to the truth is the stock character of femme fatale, who formulates her own versions of events, creates effective deceptions, and drives other troubled characters towards ruin and disaster. Thus Jacques Tourneur's movie not only deliberately hides, but also exploits a myriad of possible truths. Perversely enough, the crimes committed in this film have their undeniable charms, suggesting that the lies, fiction and illusions are more interesting, more complex, more comforting and surely more palpable than the truth.

Bibliography

Burzyńska A., Markowski M.P., *Teorie literatury XX wieku. Podręcznik*, Kraków 2006.

Jenson D., *Trauma and its Representations*, Baltimore 2001.

Kearney M.F., *Film Noir Guide*, Stradford 2003.

Markowski M.P., *Nietzsche. Filozofia interpretacji*, Kraków 2001.

Miklitsch R., *Siren City: Sound and Source Music in Classic American Noir*, New Brunswick–Rutgers 2011.

Olfert Ch.M., *Aristotle on Practical Truth*, Oxford 2017.

Ryan M.-L., Grishakova M., *Intermediality and Storytelling*, Berlin–New York 2010.

Schaeffer J.-M., *Pourquoi la fiction*, Paris 1999.

Spicer A., *Historical Dictionary of Film Noir*, Lanham 2010.

Tourneur J., director, *Out of the Past*, RKO Pictures, 1947.